

SOBER REPLY
TO THE
SOBER ANSWER
OF
REVEREND Mr. CAWDREY,
To a serious Question propounded, viz.

Whether the Ministers of England are bound by the Word of God to baptise the Children of all such Parents, which say they believe in Jesus Christ, but are grossly Ignorant, Scandalous in their Conversations, Scoffers at Godliness, and refuse to submit to Church-Discipline?

The Affirmative is not sufficiently cleared.

ALSO,

The Question of Reverend Mr. Hooker concerning the Baptisme of Infants, of Parents non-Confederate is cleared, and it may serve for an Answer to Mr. Cawdrey's Diatribe, with him upon the question.

With A Post-Script to Reverend Mr. Blake.

By G I: FIRMIN Minister to the Church in Shalford.

JOB 6. 24.

Teach me and I will hold my Tongue, and cause me to understand wherein I have erred.

Imprimatur JOS: CARYLL.

L O N D O N,
Printed by J. G. and are to be sold by Robert Littlebury at the
Unicorn in Little-Britaine, 1653.

SOBERLY

TO THE HONORABLE

THE SENATE

OF THE UNITED STATES

IN SENATE, JANUARY 18, 1870.

REPORT

OF THE

COMMISSIONERS OF THE

LAND OFFICE

IN RESPONSE TO A

RESOLUTION PASSED

BY THE SENATE

ON JANUARY 14, 1869.

WASHINGTON:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,

1870.

1870.

1870.

1870.

1870.

TO
THE COURTEOUS
READER.

He Searcher of hearts knoweth with how little pleasure I appeared in this Controversie, and what little content I have in resolving to baptise the children of such as the question mentions: it would have been a mark of a more holy spirit (as well as stronger parts) because it pleads for purity of an Ordinance: but for an impure heart to plead for a pure Ordinance is a most loathsome thing. Had not such persons in the question mentioned, pleaded the examples of other Ministers as their strongest ground, (telling me that other Ministers laughed at me for my practise) and also publicly opposed me when I had dealt with them lovingly in private before, I had never appeared in print, which I did with an eager desire of satisfaction, supposing that Ministers would not laugh at others, unless they had strong grounds for their own practise, which now I hoped to see: the practise being not mine alone (for then I had justly deserved blame) but of many others before me who baptise not all.

As for Mr. Cawdrey who hath pleased to undertake the answer [for which I really thank him] I saw not his piece against Mr. Hooker till I had printed; but now I have read over that Diatribe and his answer to me, I confesse I am still unsatisfied: yet small matters would carry me to that which my owne will chooseth most readily (God is my witness I have no sinister respect in my practise) and which would be to my advantage in severall respects if I might baptise all.

I was somewhat ashamed to see so holy and able a man as Mr. Hooker, to be joyned with me by Mr. Cawdrey: if the nearness of a holy man will shame one, what will the nearness of a holy God doe? But since Providence hath done it, I did a little more seriously consider of Mr. Hookers question, though different from mine, and I hope ~~we~~ have so cleared Mr. Hooker out of himselfe, that it will give content to the Reader. If I write against the Truth, Christ will, and I desire he would blast it.

The Reader may perceive by the mentioning of that eminent man of God Mr. Daniel Rogers, of Wetherfield, that this Treatise was finished before his Death, and I sent this Reply to him to view over; he sent me them back with this Letter.

Deare Cousin Firmin, I have sent you both your Books againe, I have read them over and see nothing wherein you fail in answer to Mr. Cawdrey: But I confesse my thoughts are not so thoroughly heat, as yours are, to weigh all circumstances, and passages of difference between you and him: its onely the concernment of such as are *in aequo*. But as for further following Mr. Cawdrey, you doe well to tell him you will henceforth *manum de tabula*, and I pray hold your minde: if of reading Books, then surely of writing such as these, there will be no end. I suppose your hast of printing hath made you thinke long; I doubt not but you have sufficiently proved, that your Arguments are not so weak, as your adversary in his disdainfull conceit hath imputed to you.

Yours,

DANIEL ROGERS.

A SOBER REPLY TO A SOBER ANSWER, &c.



IF Baptisme were a means of Regeneration, as is the preaching of the Word, then I should not dare to refuse the Baptizing of any person, what ever: or if Baptisme were so necessary to Salvation, that all those Children which are Baptized, and die in their Infancy shall be saved, and those which are not Baptized, and die in their Infancy shall perish [as *Augustine* affirms (I think) ten times in one Epistle] then Mr. *Cawdry* did justly take me with rightnesse [as he doth P. 28. and if he had said worse I should have submitted] for non-admitting of some Children to Baptisme. But neither the first (*a*) nor the second (*b*) doe our Orthodox Divines
 (*a*) *Wala. Tr. l. p. 85. & 491.*
 affirme: Baptisme then being not appointed to bring persons into union *Synop. p. 28. diff.*
 with Christ, but suppose union, or to bring persons into the Covenant, *44. 26. 27. 28.*
 but suppose a person already within the Covenant, being a Scale of it, and
 of all those glorious privileges contained in the Covenant, certainly this
 is not an Ordinance that is lightly to be regarded, [nor shall be I am
 confident when Christ comes to reform his Church indeed] but those
 (*b*) *Glanv. Tr. 4. l. 5. c. 8.*
 who doe Administer this (being stewards of it) had need look to whom *Bell. Kaur. Tr. 3. l. 2. c. 1.*
 they give out this sacred privilege. Had God died up Ministers so, that
 we should administer it onely to call Believers, then we had a hard task,
 he hath left us a greater latitude, but whether such a latitude as now the
 question mentions, is that we are searching out. Reverend Mr. *Cawdry*
 hath yielded P. 26. That such a person as the question mentions is not justly
 qualified to be a Church member. Also P. 17. he saith thus, when we
 say a Professor of the Faith is sufficient to qualify a Man to be made a

continued a Member: and he who means a true profession will be made by these
 be believed in Jesus Christ, though worthy to be as in the fall; but then
 at last, when coming to be life appears in the morning, and the light of
 no great positive signs of his holiness. Let there be little positive signs ad-
 ded to a competent measure of Knowledge, and Conversion as you say,
 and we shall agree in the point. Also in the *History of the Church*, p. 89,
 he affirmeth; That, wicked Men are no fit materials of a visible Church.
 And p. 94. 95. he moves a question because it is hard to judge of the mi-
 "nimum quod sit of Knowledge or Holiness to make a man a fit member
 "of a Church, whether it were not safer for the Church to proceed by
 "Negation rather than Affirmation: That is, in admitting of members
 "members there is nothing appears to be contrary, but that the party is
 "so much of saving Knowledge, and so faire a conversation in holiness, as may
 "consist with true grace? This is very faire, and certainly there will be some
 "little positive signs in such a person, and you may admit him by affirma-
 "tion. Mr. Coadjutor hath fully convinced me in that which is the ground of
 my scruple, for when I observed divers persons came to demand Baptism
 of me, for their children, and I found them grossly ignorant in the ne-
 cessary points of Salvation, and farre from understanding the nature of the
 Sacrament, and also when their conversation was proved by witness to be
 scandalous; and so from what Mr. Coadjutor hath set down, I concluded
 whether I was bound to give away such a soul as this, and that I should
 lovingly request them to forbear a while, and stay in for more knowledge
 (before to baptize them) and so to labour to rectify their scandalous
 conversation, then I would do it. *in fine*

P. 15.

To Mr. Coadjutor's my practice, and tell the World I have confuted
 my Opinion and my Practice, and while I go about to prove the Neg-
 ative, I have concluded the Affirmative; and that is by one sentence which
 I have affirmed, *that, so long as wicked persons are tolerated they may con-
 tinue to be so.* I will my sentence, *I shall presently give it, (completely)*
with the same (and my) reasons (as I have said). *in fine* You have
 said that I have said in the same Page that I have three times, *in fine*
in fine I propose, what I have affirmed I will own; there is a fourth
 time where I have said the same words in p. 94. 95. (it should be, the num-
 ber are false printed) *that, such persons are ignorant and scandalous, if
 they are not brought to such a measure, they have a right to be Baptized,
 and so to the Lord's Supper, (as I have said); by these words, you must
 not suppose that you do not understand me; you must not say such the
 words, that is far from my thoughts, for then I should stand true
 to all my Divines and others now; who alone will keep back, let me be
 sure their Part from the Lord's Supper, I condemn: them not at all,
 but make they have done well, though you care think so by your passage.
 P. 11. that then is the meaning of it, You must not deny it; but they have
 done well, and so to the Lord's Supper. But I suppose you will under-*

As you say.
 Review Mr.
 Hooker p. 99.

flood

and I thought my self. [then by the word binds him to it, which is the
 pleth of the Question] Baptize it, dissolved in the premises? if you say,
 it was intended in the Major; when I said it may be Baptized. Sir I cannot
 tell that, if a Minister will admit a Man into the Church as a Member,
 though the Man be not qualified as you have told us Members must be,
 but very scandalous in conversation, and grossly ignorant, yet the Minister
 thinks he have enough to admit him a Member, and consequently hee
 Baptizeth him; Such a Minister may Baptize him if he will, he may say,
 (*A Member admitted may be Baptized, but this is a Member admitted*)
 But the word doth not binde him; no, he prophanes the Ordinance, though
 he will admit him a Member.

However Sir you should have expressed this in the Major, as you have
 done in the Conclusion, then your Major I would have denyed; you will say
 to me, the Major is my own proposition, and upon that I argue, and show you
 and the World how you have confused your selfe. No Sir I do utterly deny it;
 shew me such a passage where I have said that scandalous Members [such
 as our English persons are, named in the Question] tolerated, may have
 their Children Baptized, and the word binds Ministers to do it. Shew your
 Reader that, and then you say something; but how faire I was from thinking
 or speaking so, the very next words unto that which you say is my sentence,
 and out of which I have confused my selfe, do declare: my words are
 these.

“ But I conceive such a person is not sufficiently qualified to make
 “ a Member of a Church, nor ought to be continued a Member of the
 “ Church: but the Church ought to seek to reforme him, or if not, to
 “ cast him out, so that if the Church will let such a person alone,
 “ and give him these Ordinances, there will be guilt charged upon that
 “ Church.

This sentence I conceive (if the Reader be but indifferent, and not pre-
 judiced against me) will save me from selfe-confusion: if the sentence
 be not true, but Mr. Cawdry had proved that the Minister is not too blame
 though he lets him alone, and yet may lawfully Baptize. Then had he
 spoken to my scruple indeed, and I would have thanked him heartily, but
 then I had not confused my selfe.

But still Mr. Caw. will urge from my owne words, thus I have said,
*Scandalous Members; if tolerated, let alone by the Church, they have a remote
 right to Baptisme and the Supper; Ergo, they may lawfully have their Children
 Baptized, and the word binds Ministers to do it.*

To this I shall answer, first to the Antecedent, then to the Con-
 sequence.

To the Antecedent I answer, first [according to our Congregationall
 Principles] that which gives a Man the first right to a Sacrament, viz. his
 interest in the Covenant of the Gospel [which you use very much against
 Mr. Hooker taking the words from himselfe] this Man hath not: for hee
 doth visibly declare to the Churches that he hath no interest in that Cove-

nant.

and your satisfaction, by what you have offered concerning the qualifications of Church-members. So then he hath no right, in that respect, all the right he hath is by the toleration of the Church, which the Church had best look to; now I do confesse that *first right* is the maine in my estimate, though not all that is required: as in a Minister, the great matter is the qualification of the person, which is his inward call, yet it is not all, but his Ordination is also requisite: but if Bishops, or Presbyters should ordaine a scandalous and ignorant for, not able to teach himselfe, nor the Church, I should extremely doubt of such a Minister: so here I conceive this *first right* is the chiefe, but yet as Mr. Hooker saith *Baptisme be must come by in a right Order, i.e. he must be a Member of some congregation*; and not an *individuum vagum*, belonging to no particular Congregation, nor any body to have inspection over him. But if Ministers will admit persons that have not this *first right*, and continue such amongst them, here indeed is a kinde of right, but this let the Ministers look to.

2. I answer according to your Principles: you make a *New Christianity alone*, within his joyning of himselfe to any congregation, to be that which gives him right, and you oppose Mr. Hooker, and the Congregational Divines for requiring that joyning to any particular Church before they will Baptize: thus you say, *All Children of Christians, as Christians have such right to Baptisme*, and in the same Page, *All Children of Christians, as such, have right to Baptisme*. Thus in your answer to me P. 12. you say, *a person Excommunicated gives right to his child Baptisme, because for state he is a Christian, and retains his Baptisme*. Now Sir I hope you meane it must be such Christianity as your selfe have said, is fit to make a Church-member [I hope you do not meane such Christianity as our question speaks of] by vertue of that say you he is a Member of the Catholike church. Now Sir if that *only* gives a Man right and his Children, and yet a Man have not that, I can see no right he hath at all, it seemes strange to me that Men should be Members of a particular Church and not of the Catholike Church; of the latter these are not Members, for they have not so much as should give them a right to that Membership, if you will hold to what you have said about the qualifications of the matter of a Church: for only such Christianity makes Men Members of the Catholike church, which these fall very short of. We use to unwind a bottom the same way we wound it, if you will winder the bottom thus, a *Professor, or Believer* (such a one as you say is fully qualified) as such, have by vertue of his profession *only*, a right to his own and Childs Baptisme, then I unwind it the same way, he that is *not* a Professor as you mention, hath no right at all. Such are those our Case speaks of.

Now Sir here lay my trouble, that since these persons in the first and maine respect have no right, but what they have is only by my toleration; this question arose: whether in the beginnings of Reformation [wherein as Junius saith, something will be extraordinary] the persons being numerous, and not so fit it may be to Excommunicate in regard of

And though I thought I had said all that I had to say, I was so scandalized after admonition, they began to shout out, "Away with the Church! Judgment from the Throne of God!" and I finished a paper which I hope some good people saw, this morning, and scandalous living, and that nothing more can be done with the members of the Church. I send you a note which I hope you speak of with some of your opponents to "Tyndalton," but I do not mention names. I am, dear friends, Obedient

Orskay, according to our Congressional Principles, which maintain a Non-Communion in each Excommunication cannot be confined against the multitude; so I do think we must not limit such Ordinances as do bind forth Communion; and so it is Not consistent in itself: More communion or Separation in form, only when there is in substance, the Excom. Prof. forth in Ordinance.

To the Confessional answer, by denying it, viz. *Ministers are not bound by the word to Baptize all the children of persons guilty, ignorant, and scandalous, though tolerated.*

2. I still carry in reference to England, where nearly all are Christians and Church members there now I still remember that I would have done, feeling the compassion of my Brethren in my own time, but your triumphing over this, and setting the World, how it look at such a contest my self, makes me by way of discourse to clear my self, though I think it is done already. Thus then I argue.

Q. 1. If such Members as the question speaks of be conscious faith, through the Ministers negligence and complicity, then the word shall be said Ministers to give the Seal of the Covenants to their Children, but the Ministers to woe, woe, the consequence is true!

20 The Antecedent I had rather have applied only to my self, then any other Ministers being far more holy then my selfe, I should thinke my selfe to have been guilty of connivance, but my question, and Mr. Carr. (as I said before) puts me upon this.

77 If the Antecedent be denied, I prove it.
78 What Ministers have power put into their hands, whereby they may reforme
79 If they will, and will not, when their Toleration comes from conscience, and so forth
80 full

But Ministers have now power put into their hands, whereby they may reform if they will, &c. Ergo :

The *Minor* is clear: for what power oppose? Church power there is none above the Ministers; for the civil power that does not oppose, but that power actually defends such Ministers, and Churches as doe reforme, and doe deny Baptisme to such scandalous ones; This favour once would have beene esteemed very great: what ever we conceive of Toleration, as how it stands, yet this benefit we have by Toleration, that Ministers need not Tolerate such persons if they will. *It is as the wind, blows as they list.*

But I perceive your Answer in P. 30: you tell us, of a Pope-like power

now, and therefore think by suspending
you, we shall all change as much, as whether Mr. Gentry will
be judicious, I leave you doubt, by observing this place and Page 20. 1.
I will not conclude of him, but that he is against any Minister that shall
do as he is clear. But Minister alone, if you mean thus, that a Minister
alone without his people, or against the Christians, consent shall suspend,
whom he please, indeed I dubbe of such a practice: but if the Members
(visible Believers) shall come and bring in witness against persons, and
desire to have them debarred, till they will amend, and thus they consent
to his Minister in suspending, I know of no Free life power here
abused.

Therefore, I will answer further.

4. If you and ten Ministers more, or as many as you please, will combine together, and set up a *Clasfiall* forme of Government; and then you estimate you have power: you may if you will, who hinders you? I know of no power that opposes you. Therefore this is not a sufficient

But he is not meeting the ground. He says to a particular Church, "you cannot form its own Members," as you seem to express, in that manner I have for down. I hope we shall find divers Classical Divines of another Opinion. I pray what is your meaning, when you say: As for Kruckendall and Learned Whittier, whose Testimony he makes use of. He says he goes not into the world, that every particular Church hath a power, namely, even Members, what power, you mean is plain, by the Declaration of Mr. Hetherington, and learned Whittier. Mr. Gaudy writes himself, Pastor of the Church at Billing. Now I pray give me a reason why to godly and able a Pastor with his Church should not have power over his own Members, unless he will contradict himselfe (as he saith, I doe) but I hope you doe not mean there is no particular Church, but a Classical Church, for that you say what before you have said of your selfe, our Churches are: several in length, and so severall Pastors in it, to make what one particular Church is very hard, but if the Church at Billing have power over its own members, why may not the Church at Abelling have the same power?

ing. Would you have King Elders to join with me? I observe divers of the Classical Divines question whether there be any such Officer ordained from the Preaching Elder. But though I have no Elders actually ordained full pastors also here and do not ordain your Elders in such a strange, improper way, yet I have with whom I look upon to be Elders, and without whom I do nothing that concerns Discipline. That which hath assisted us, in all importunities of my maintenance, being cut off from a profession which I disclaim. A Separation, when I was first called; for maintenance that I got from my place and not from a distance to maintain myself; I am sensible of my good here.

When I was ordained by the Presbytery, I thought I had the power

Review Mr.
Hooker p. 121.

3.

45

of a Pastour conveyed to me: now, one part is to *Rule*, I think, but to say I cannot put forth that power alone; but I must have more Elders to joyn with before I can do any thing; I desire to see a Scripture for that, because Discipline was carried on by more then one in the Examples we have in the Scripture, there being more then one Officer in those Churches, must this needs conclude; I therefore the power of a Pastour must lie dormant, if he have no other Elders to joyn with him, though his people doe as I said before, I should deny this consequence.

5. Suppose I stay till the *Gleffis* be formed and *Ald*, shall wee have power then to reform? But suppose my people take other Ministers of the *Gleffis* besides my selfe, what power they have to reforme them, who made them Rulers over the people against their wills and consent, having called none but *my self* for their Pastour? you must have a call you say to put forth your power *alias* *seculis*, in another Church.

6. Suppose there were a Church on an Island, where there was onely a Pastour, should he and his people be denyed to reforme, since there is no other Church neere him? if you will give him power, I pray give me, for it is all one to be on an *Island*, where there are no more Churches than one combine, and so helpe one another, as to be in another place where are thousands, but none will: it is *cannot* there, it is *will not* heare. Yet Sir, there is a Congregational Church in the next Towne, and when need is I seeke counsell of that reverend Officer Mr. *Dan Rogers*.

I could say more; but I forbear. What you say concerning Mr. *Ketch*, I have not seeme that worthy Mans labours, for I live in an obscure Village remote from *London*, and feldome heare of Bookes, neither will my means allow me to buy all Bookes that come out. But Sir, I take your Opinion, for you say in your Epistle, it is hard to judge, whether his way or mine be the best, or worst way of Cure. Now if it be hard to say, then I perceive you are not clear your selfe, for what he hath writ.

So much for the Apreece; now I come to the Consequence. *Woe*. If it be consequence and negligence that is the cause of this Toleration [which I doubt is true in many] then the word *doth not* bind me, or I may lawfully *Baptize*.

If full admissions will not justify a Minister in administering the Ordinance of Baptisme, then neither will full Toleration justify a Minister in administering Baptisme.

Ann. vol. p. 315.

But the consequence is true. Ergo, the consequence is true. Sinfull admissions will not: learned *Giles* said: no Conscience Minister would adventure to Baptize one, who had manifest and infallible signes of non-regeneration, we cannot be answerable to God, if we should.

Page 544.

Allo he *fish*, is more a prophesie of Baptisme, in Baptisme a Catechumen, being manifestly under the power of abominable sinnes; although he should give a *form*, and Ordained confession of Faith. This is more then thousands of the Church members of England can doe, and yet live under the power of sinnes bad enough. His grounds I have quoted before

with

For the consequence, if it be said, there is more required in one who is a Member, he must first be cast out: this takes not off the force of the Argument, the person is sinfully tolerated, as well at first sinfully admitted; as he might have been and should have been denied admission, and so the Ordinance had been saved, so this person may and ought to be dealt with (there being now power in the hands of Ministers) to the Ordinance is saved, sinfull admission caused the Ordinance at first to be profaned; sinfull toleration cause it now to be profaned.

If you would turne me off here (as you doe afterward) by telling me the Argument should proceed of the same person, which is doth not, the Child and the Parents are different persons. Sir, this will not serve the turne, my Argument proceeds upon one and the same Title, the Parents Title is the Childs Title, the Child hath no other Title, nor pleads any other but the Parents Title, the Parent expresses his Title for himselfe, and his Child being a branch of that Stock; if the child pleaded a Title distinct from the Parents, as a Title of its own, then my Argument were fallacious [as I shall charge you anon] but if the child could speak, it could plead only this, my Parents is within the Covenant, the Covenant is made with the Believing Parents, and his or her seed; Therefore give me the Seale: by vertue of him, or her it is made with us.

You tell me afterward, P. 25. I may Baptize the Child of the profaneest Man in England, as of the godliest [my Argument tends to that] Man; only you would have me grieve that I cannot reform this abuse.

Whence I observe. First, this ordinance may be abused. Secondly, de Facto it is abused in this administration to such vile persons; only say you his saves all, you have no power to reform this Abuse, and for that I much grieve; but this I deny, I have power, and so have you and many more, but by you I cannot conceive the Ordinance is abused, for if the word bindes me to give such a person the Ordinance; I know not how I abuse it in following of the command of the word, so that I have no such cause to grieve in respect of the administering of the Ordinance, for that is well enough, while such a one is tolerated; I am bound to do it [that is our Question] say you, the grieve must be in regard of the Mans toleration in the Church. But Sir, remember one thing more, you tell us though such a person be Excommunicated, yet because he is a Christian, and retains his Baptisme; Therefore the Minister must Baptize his Child: what cause of grieving is there now, for what power is there beyond Excommunication? so that you do but deceive us in talking of Reformation.

If Toleration, though sinfull, will save us from profaning of Ordinances, then Ministers may take their ease as to that point, and let all corrupt, and vile Members alone, let them partake of both Seals, for so long as tolerated, the word binds you to give them Baptisme, and the Supper, and the word doth not binde me to profane an Ordinance.

2. Argument.

So much for my first Argument. I cannot's Island Argument, viz. to prove, though scandalous Members in England are tolerated, and by virtue of that Toleration they will challenge any Ordinance; yet the word binds not me to give.

If so, then the Ministers of England are bound to administer the Lords Supper to the grossest ignorant persons, horribly scandalous, Rascals, &c. in England.

But the Consequence is false; Ergo, the Antecedent is false.

The Consequence is clear, they are Church-members tolerated, saith Mr. Caw. we have no power to helpe; Therefore they may by virtue of that Principle, by which he hath me on the hip, as he thinks.

P. 94.

I thinke Sir you speake the same words, in Review of Mr. Hooker, notoriously scandalous Deceit, tolerated in a Church, whilst tolerated they are Members to all Ordinances for themselves, and their posteritie. Then all the Rascals, &c. are members to the Lords Supper, and you have no power, you say to helpe it. Yet I presume you would finde power before you would admit all such to the Supper.

This I wouldaine have cleared to me, that the Officers are bound to looke to the Members more in admitting them to the Supper then to Baptisme: and the Supper, respect both the same Covenant, there is but one condition [whether there be *Conditio propitiella* * in the Covenant of grace is another question] of the covenant of grace, viz. That man then, who can rightly take a Seale, or Convey a Seale of this Covenant to his, must visibly appear to have the condition of the Covenant, [which is the first and maine right,] if he do so appeare, and therefore can convey the Seale to his Child, why he may not have the other Seale for himselfe, appearing to be a Believer, and also being in right Order for my part, I see no reason.

* Twiss. Vind.
gra. praef. Sc. &
8.

Ames Medat.
Th. c. 24. Th. 19.
Rhetor. Ex ar.
Apoph. 313.

I must not here condemne the holy Divines, who have before kept this Ordinance; neither dare I say the Assembly of Divines did very weakly, to trouble the Parliament in requesting the Houses to make an Act against such persons, that they might be debarred from the Lords Supper, which I must doe, if they were bound to give it while such were tolerated Members, they would finde hard worke to have Excommunicated all these. If any say I condemne the former Divines for Baptizing all. I pray let them say no more then they heare me say, I do not do so, onely I would gladly see the reason of the practise, and for those, who lived before these times, I can answer my selfe another way.

I pray remember my Question, how it can be proved that the Officers must looke more to this Seale then the other. 1 Cor. 11. It is said, *Let a man examine himself, &c.* True, so he hath need before he comes to Baptisme: but what is this to the Officers of *Corinth*, the Lords Supper was administered every Lords Day in those times, what must the Officers examine them every weeke? here is worke enough, they looked to them [or should have done] when they first took them in to be Members, and so if they did

dot.

but rather in such manner as they were so bound after their allowance, as
cast out, him in so doing they loved rather Ordinance as well as this. But
we have a notion taken up, as if Discipline were appointed only to save the
Lords Supper from being profaned, and no other Ordinance.

Will the 44 Sect. 9 prove it? I pray prove that *Sanctuary* (there men-
tioned) means only the *Lords Supper*, the *Sanctuary* and *Lords Supper* are
isoduradur, i.e. those who interpret, they ought to prove their interpreta-
tion, which you must clear to make your answer good, in Ps. 6.

Will 1 Cor. 4. 2. prove it? *Stewards must be faithfull, this must be only in
the Lords Supper.*

Will Mat. 7. 6. prove it? *Holy things must not be given to Dogs.* Tertullian
applies this Text to the Administration of Baptisme, as well as to the Sup-
per. And if it must be at the first, then why not as well when it comes to
be administered by virtue of ones who is a Dog. [The word I love not to
use in respect of others, knowing my wicked heart] there may be many
who are Church-members by reason of Toleration only (and that To-
leration its doubted if it be not sinfull) who yet are such Dogs as that
Text mentions, and upon this Notion Ministers have before exclu-
ded them from the Supper. Your selfe speake to this purpose *Dissar*.
Page 184.

Dr Bap.

3. One Argument more to prove, *though such may challenge by reason of
my Toleration, yet I am not bound to give*, and here I will give examples of
of what I have found, and know concerning ignorance, then draw up my
Argument.

3. Argument.

In my owne Parish, I was questioning with one about his estate, hee
had lived long in *Essex*. that which the Man builded upon was this, said he,
I have been in Drunkard, and I Repent. What it was to *Repent*? he could not
tell: but then I enquired what knowledge he had of Christ; The Man I
perceived knew nothing of him, but when I told him how Christ was
God-man sent to fulfill the Law, to die, to make satisfaction to Divine
Justice, and such ordinary plaine things. The Man wondered to heare
such things, in so much indeed that I could not but wonder my selfe that
a man should live above 50. years in such a place as *Essex* is, and not know
these plaine things.

Another was asked, what Christ was? the man could give him no an-
swer: to help him, he was asked againe, whether he were a God, or a Man?
he answered plainly hee could not tell, but said, *he thought he was a
Spirit.*

This is an Observation that I have made, [because Mr. *Gaw.* sayes we
are all Christians, P. 4.] when I have beene discoursing with people about
their conditions, they will tell me stories of what they have not been, and
some other silly matters, but for Christ, not one word of him, unlesse
when I have put it upon them; *what is Christ nothing?* then they will tell
me, *yes, they must believe in Christ*, God forbid the contrary, but to know
Christ, and what it is to believe in him, alas they are far short of this. And
this

this is not onely my observation, but a godly Minister in *Norfolk* parish told me the very same thing he observed in his Parish, not one word of Christ, till he put it into their minds; then having taken up Christ by Tradition, they must say something.

But for the Covenant of Grace (which Baptisme respects also) that is the strangest thing to people, they know not what it meanes.

For *Sin*, people have a Tradition that there is that which people call *Sin*, but for themselves to be guilty of any particular sinne, I have beene forced to run over the Commandements, open them, and tell them how my self have been guilty, and yet could I scarce convince some, they were guilty, only all are sinners, and so are they.

A godly friend of mine told me he asked a Woman that was talking with him, what shee bad for Heaven? shee answered him roundly, *she had never offended God in all her Life*: yet shee was above 50 yeares of Age.

Another told him, *she had kept all the Commandements*: shee was not so old indeed, but he had much a doe to convince her, she had broke one, yet these persons lived where there had been excellent Preaching.

Another coming to a neere friend of mine to have his Child Baptized, he asked him why he would have it Baptized? he answered, *because others had*: he asked him what good it would do his Child? he answered, *As much as heretofore*.

Another came to him, he asked him, how many Gods there were? he answered, *Two*; supposing he misrooke himselfe; for the Commandements he asked him, how many Commandements there were? he answered *Two*, he asked him which was the first? he answered *Salvation*; the second I know not what it was: the Man professed he did answer as well as he could.

I thinke you are not much better in *Norrbamptonshire*, for a godly Minister told me of one in his Parish, that had a Prayer, but I think there was never such a one heard before, this sentence was often repeated, *And Jesu was Her Name*.

These instances have been since our Reformation began, and if Ministers should search all, certainly we should be amazed to heare the Answers.

Now Sir, I apply this: you say all these are Church-Members tolerated, they can therefore challenge Baptisme, and because their Toleration give them a *Right*, Therefore the word bindes me to Baptize their Children. But Sir, may I not better put these off for a time untill by Catechizing of them, they come to understand Sinne, Christ, and the Covenant of Grace? the word saith, *Teach and Baptize*, yea say you, at the first constitution; but if we finde such persons as you call Members, continued in constituted Churches that are ignorant in the knowledge of Sin, Covenant of Grace, yea and of Christ [save onely they have taken up such a Name that there is one Christ, and the Nation receives him] as
are

as the very Heathen, (say for the Heathen know more) is there not as much and more reason to Teach them before I will Baptize by vertue of them, let the Reader Judge.

Am I bound to Baptize a Child presently so soon as it is brought? They make nothing to keepe Children a fortnight, a moneth, yea more (according as their occasions are) before they will offer them to Baptisme, may not I then, finding the Parents unfit, delay it to be two moneths, till they are taught before I will Baptize? What is the danger, where is the Rule broken, where am I tyed to Baptize one so soone as offered, though never so unfit? the eighth day that was set for Circumcision, concerns not us, we can Baptize before if we will.

So for Scandall, if uncleane persons shall bring their Bastards, the Ranters, or who you will, must I presently Baptize, because you say a Church member tolerated will challenge a right to the Ordinance? shall I not first require Repentance?

John required Repentance: yea say you at first constitution, he and Apostles did. But Sir, shall persons now be as vile and worse [for the continuance in the Church, aggravates their ignorance and scandall,] then at the first constitution, and shall I not now require Repentance of such before I Baptize by vertue of them? yea, and that the Repentance may in judgement of Charity give hopes of a true Repentance: and if any will grant it for this one scandall; I know not but the same Rule will reach for other Scandalls.

If you will Baptize all these ignorant ones, and the Scandalous ones without any more ado, *but so presse the Covenant* [which they know not] on them, as you say, do if you please.

To conclude this Head of *Selfe confusion*: I am not yet beaten off, but that passage of the *Leyden Professore*, doe a little favour me, the question was, *whether if there be a great number in the Church, who offend in Doctrine or Life, may we now use Excommunication?* The answer is, *If men be openly and contumaciously corrupt, Let the multitude be great, yet so such, godly Pastors ought not, nor may give the Sacraments of Divine Grace, but with one consent they must be denied, and commit the event to God: because godly Pastors may not communicate the Signes of Grace to them, to whom Christ doth openly deny them, and forbids the Communicating of them.*

Here I observe, they doe not stand for the Excommunication of a multitude, for these words *Sacraments*, and *Signes of Grace*, if there be *Enallage numbers*, that they should meane onely the Lords Supper. I should marvell at it, that there should be so much paines taken in solving of the question, and then to come and tell us onely of *Suspension from the Supper*, which is so common a thing.

But for their reason I would make use of that, and when they have brought me the Scripturall ground, where Christ forbids the Ministers to give the Parent one *Signe of Grace*, I will see if the same ground will not censure us to give the Child the other *Signe of Grace*, by vertue of this Parent.

You know Tertullians minde, concerning Adulterers, 2. 1. *De pudicitia*. And Cyprian te's us it was the practise of some not to receive such a gaine. Ep. 52. *Synop. par. Diss.* 48. Th. 31.

For your Pre-*sent*, and *Admission*, that cannot be so be concluded in another place, I must now answer to *Self-confutation*.

Conse. l. 4. c. 27.
Sec. 6.

D. Ames speaks something for me. *Qui aliquis modo in professione sua ad Ecclesiam pertinet, sed factum tamen Dei speret violari, eorum Infantibus cum aliquo discrimine debent Baptizari: ut scilicet ut quod factum requirit, & in ipso deest, per aliquos quantum fieri possit suppleatur.* 1. Nam distinctio aliqua inter puros & impuros debet in sacris omnibus observari, ad honorum consolationem; correctionem malorum, & omnium adificationem. 2. Instituta Dei non possunt aliter ab omni pollutione conservari. The Doctor I suppose would have Sureties joyned, but if these Sureties cannot bee proved to be an appointment of God, then hee is yet stronger for mee.

By this time I hope I have cleared my selfe in the Judgement of an indifferent Reader from *Self-confutation*; I knew this Church-membership was the strongest Argument that could be brooght, and therefore mentioned it; that Church-members might challenge any Ordinance, while let alone, I could not thinke otherwise, but that therefore I was bound to administer the Seals, as if their challenging, which comes onely by reason of their Toleration in the Church, would make my Administration warrantable, though they are never so wicked, and tolerated sinfully, this I could not believe. So that my *Self-confutation* arises from something, you put upon mee, which I owne not, the great strength then of your Booke against me, I hope is weakned, and all those answers from hence, which you make great use of, are no answers.

Before I passe to a further examination of your Answer, let me propound one thing more, wherein I heartily desire satisfaction from you, being not cleare in the thing my selfe, viz. *Whether all the People in England (under which we comprehend Wales) be Members of true Churches?* for if it can be proved that all the Congregations in England, are not true Churches, then I should have an Argument strong enough against you: but sir, I am not so satisfied to say they are not, nor yet so cleare to say they are; Therefore I desire to learne.

In my Booke P. 43. I said *I did but faintly acknowledge such a thing that all are Church-members*: but afterward when I came to write in defence of the godly Presbyteriall Ministers [whom I honour and reverence] against the Separatists, I said I dare not undertake to prove all the Congregations in England to be true Churches: so that I doe not fly back, because of your Booke, it was done long before, seriously debating with my selfe, what the Separatists would urge against me, thus I phansied they would argue.

Page 4.

Iuu Divin. p. 37

A Church is a company of those who are called [and this call must be answered, or else it is nothing] To the visible profession of Faith in Christ, and obedience unto Christ, according to the Gospell, This is the Freybyterians definition, say they.

Bis

And those of the Congregation in the Church of England, and Wales, and other places, are not good Companies, are, I say, they are no Churches.

Definition consist in essentialism: and definitions if true are eternally true. Now how can there be the effect where there is not the essential cause, according to their own grant?

"I would have answered, if you speake of a pure visible Church, you say right: but there may be a true Church visible though divers corrupt Members, as in Corinth, Sardis, &c. To this I conceived they would reply thus, as for Corinth, Sardis, &c. We doe not deny it, for there were real Christians, and visible Christians also, (though there were corrupt ones,) and these held up the essentiall cause of the Church: but in divers of these Parishes we shall not finde foure it may be so much as visible Saints, if we take in knowledge, and what that definition, and Mr. Cawdrys qualifications require for a visible Saint.

Besides what Corinth and Sardis had, was only by way of Calling as say the London Ministers: but what ours are, was and is by the Sword of the Magistrate, King Henry the eighth he left us Popish. King Edward the sixth, he takes away the Masse-booke, and sends the booke of Common prayer, though the people love the other way, yet if the King will have it so, it must be so. Queene Mary comes and shee turnes about againe, the people follow her. Queene Elizabeth shee takes away Masse againe, if it were ten times in a yeare saith Mr. Rogers, the people will turne with the State. Fox Mart. vol. 3. This is the Call, and what have we now? but divers ignorant souls sent into these places to read a booke of Common prayer, and this is their profession: this is strange making of Churches, this was not so in the times when Churches were first constituted.

Such Churches they were at their first constitution, according to Mr. Cawdrie Page 7. who doth not regard what they were before this time, so from first to last it is hard to say of divers Parishes that there have been so many visible Saints as might make a Church.

In the same Page you tell us That some people received the Gospel after the Example of Kings, and were Baptized for company (as Simon Magus it seems) but say sir, the Text saith, he believed (I know not in truth) and continued with Philip: his conversation was such as for ought I can see till Peter came downe, they had good opinion of him. Reverend Calvin upon the Text doth not judge so slightly as you here expresse, and your selfe, Page 17. speake more clearly of Simon Magus, then you doe here, and nearer the truth.

Now sir you say though the People thus follow onely for company [though the case was otherwise here, for the People would not have changed had they been left to their own Libertie, but the feare of a King or a Queen compelled them] Yet if they take upon them an outward profession, that was sufficient to give a right to themselves, and their children for Baptisme: and consequently they were a true Church, though not a perfect and pure Church.

But

Ibidem.

8 A. 13.

But sir, you are speaking of the first Time no Discipline, what a strange Proposition doe you make here to give Title, how much different from what you have said before, is required to make a Church-member?

Page 7.

You say, *is it a true Church*, how will you predicate Truth of an effect, when it wants the essentiall cause? to predicate *verum* or *verē* of *caus* is good, but how is here the entity of a Church, when the *materiall* cause is wanting? and if the *materiall* be Wanting, the *formall* is also. The *formall* cause, suppose the *materiall* which it doth inform, and distinguish, &c.

I should further have objected against the Separatists, *what will you make of those Parishes, are they infallible?* They would answer, let them be what they will, they are not, nor ever were (that we know, or others) fit matter for Churches, if the *Presbyterians* will stand to their own Definition, but they would say againe, they are *State-christians* made such by the power of the *Civill sword*, not *Church-christians* made by the *Spiritual sword*. And this shewes it that in their Religion, they will not go one step beyond, what the *State* commands: and had the *State* let them alone, they would still have held to their *Papery*. And talke to them of any other Church, but the place they met in, they understand you not.

Had I said, *But they are Baptized*, they would answer, if men will abuse Baptisme, as if a Minister should go and Baptize *Indians*, must we needs say therefore they are a Church? Baptisme doth not make a Church, for it presupposeth a Church.

The sum is, I saw so much difficulty that I did rather avoid that, so undertooke to prove that many Congregations were true Churches, besides those which you call Independent Churches.

In this therefore I desire satisfaction, and hope I shall see something by this occasion, but I am sure it would trouble holy Ministers to goe into such places, and Administer Baptisme to the people abiding, as now they are.

And now sir, I come to examine your answer, and the many faults you finde with me, I shall take the Booke as it lies, and goe over every page, as briefly as I can.

Page 1.

First, your question, *whether I meane that all these meet in one person*, Ignorant, scandalous, &c. or *singly* of any of them. Sir, I was thinking of it my selfe, but I did suppose the Reader would understand me to meane *singly*, if men were *grossely Ignorant*, and would continue so wilfully, though they are intreated, and assistance offered to helpe, but will not (as is the case with us) such deserve Excommunication, and you affirm as much P. 17: 19.

For *Scandalous conversations*, *Scorning as godlinesse*, I supposed no question would be made of it.

Page 2.

For *Submitting to Church-Discipline*, though I know some few *Erastians* did deny it, yet the bulke of Christians would never question it; being so plain; but however you finde afterward that I speake of such as are convinced

continued of it (which was my only ill-usage) for I did not put it into the
question (though I express'd afterwards) you take advantage against me
p. 18, 19, 20, 27. no less than four times to make it serve for an answer
some. Well Sir, I perceive your minde is not to make any favourable con-
struction, though you have my minde cleared in another place; only you
lie on the catch.

Come on then Sir, since this is your spirit, let us see whether this will
give you such an advantage: the question is, whether Ministers are bound to
baptize Children of Parents, grossly ignorant, &c. Yes, saith Mr. C. the Parents
are Church-members, and though notoriously scandalous they are Mem-
bers to all Ordinances, while they are tolerated & tolerated say I, what
means you by that? you answer, the Church hath not proceeded to Censure
and Excommunication, for till excommunicated they are Church-members
I say and then also by your Doctrine; but then say I, for excommunication,
I know no such thing, nor any Church-discipline: you say there are godly
ones not convinced of this Ordinance, and if godly ones, then not wicked
ones, sure enough they may as well renounce it: thus Discipline is rejected
by all; so then ~~an excommunication~~, *you say* doth not help one while
but their gross ignorance, &c. is sufficient for me, for Excommunication
there is no such thing, ~~say~~ *you say* & thus the stronger, no less, there be
a way to help by the pro-parent and Adoption, which are your no-
tions.

I see Sir you will plead any thing to make an answer, and seems to shake
hands with the *Erastian*, but if you and other Ministers (as I perceive
some such) be so favourable to the opinion, then never open your
mouths more for Church government: Or say you, and others, there are
godly people of the opinion, well Sir, what then? put safe *Mr. C.* ~~is~~
not of the opinion, but his Members are; suppose there were some scanda-
lous Member to be excommunicated, you would doe it, and you exhort the
body to consent to you in it [to doe it, *renounce* this is a poor thing] they
rise up, no Sir, we will not consent to you in it, for we know no
such Ordinance, we will hold Communion with him, ~~that~~ *that* are godly
persons, now what will you doe? ~~what better works we make in pleading~~
for opinions.

For the *explicit Church Covenant* you speak of in this page, it will let
it alone till p. 5. where you revive it again.

Then you rehearse Mr. Hooker's sentence and there I do say that I do not
accord with him &c. If so, then I protest this continues you, that you have
not spoken right, when you said I borrow my grounds from Mr. Hooker, In your Epist.
how doe I borrow my grounds from him, whom I agree to follow, to the Reader.
say I doe? if I had done so, Mr. Hooker is a man of whom one may bor-
row, but I do not remember what ground I borrowed, but I was glad
when I saw so many and holy men defend some things which before
I conceived were right, for in this difference here, I am sure Mr.
Hooker was now either in England, he would not dispute all the children of
any

Page 3.

Page 4:

Diary. 185.

Page 5.

...any more...
...the House, and therefore we do not differ
...the

Then you come to my first premise, which is, [The Infant abstracted from the Parent, gives no reason why it should be baptised] *this* for you have otherwise proposed by Mr. Hooker [then its unlikely to be borrowed of him] *then* you tell me it is *rightly* proposed, yet Sir, very right: it is ordinary with Divines to lay a proposition first, further off, then to consider nearer: neither do I see that you have one with confused it but yielded to: do you baptise any Child in your parish without considering it in relation to a Parent? do you consider it in it, false abstracted from any other; and yet baptise it? I say make an argument out of that Text: In your Title-page, last, vol. 24. which I presume you bring for Infant Baptism; and consider the Infant alone as abstracted from the Parent: you say presently that the *Children of England are Christians born*, how? by reason of the House, soil, or the Parent? then its a Christian Child; and in relation to such it one it is baptised: Thus you find fault with Mr. Hooker, but if you will cross him, or my self (who am not worthy to be named in the day with him) lay down this proposition, viz. *Forasmuch as England is a Christian Country, and its Children are Christians born*, *then* it is baptised: if you will maintain this, then I confess you may find fault.

For your second Answer, when any body practise as you say there, then let such a one consider it: you might have spared those lines, for I know none such: I do it before the child is brought.

Then you come to the second premise: [The child is baptised as considered in relation to a parent (and or both) and the same] For Sir, Mr. Hooker did I think the same journey, and this you have confused largely (that is your meaning) in *Diary* p. 185, of that hereafter: Only now you add,

First, you say *this* in effect: *in the same with the former: on the Negative*, *the* *affirmative* *proposition* *is* *known* *to* *be* *before*, *only* *for* *clearness* *sake*, *we* *use* *to* *express* *things* *first* *by* *showing* *what* *they* *are* *not* *[as* *with* *Love*, *union* *with* *God* *father*.] *then* *what* *they* *are*, *so* *I* *do* *here*, *and* *I* *hope* *no* *fault* *in* *so* *doing*.

Secondly, you tell me of two other ways for children to come to Baptism besides the next parent: of which hereafter.

Next, you say I take occasion to find a Church. A society of visible Saints joined together by way of covenant. And here you observe no thing. You know the Church is a particular Society, not any Member of a Church; but of such a Church as they will be of, being a Member only of one Church, and by virtue of this require Baptism for it. And how? I suppose you will say, that you will not war with a Catholic Church, yet I would, neither do I know any under standing deny it, but I desire you for me, will you make such a Church? But if you had said so, yet if I own that, I

but

but whether it be any thing else, I see some difficulties in that, and
leave for further time to discuss it. The Conclusion then for which I
can deserve ought to be as nothing, for then and the very same then in
the conclusion in point of Discipline. I know for admitting the Seals
in another Congregation, which that notion brings in, there some Con-
gregational men differ, and so for one Minister to excommunicate in another
Congregation, that they will not own (nor do you but upon a call) they
will go along with other Officers and assist them in clearing out wrongs,
and helping them what may be, only they will not put forth their power
against such to whom they are no Officers. I trouble not these holy men,
in that whole who will differ with such men upon these points. I think
do not well. The other part doth not concern my question, neither
am I so clear in it as I wish I were. I shall humbly propound my
thoughts.

A man must first be a Member of a particular visible Church before
he can be of the Catholique visible Church, then your notion will not
hold, but the Antecedent is true. Ergo, the Consequent is true.

Answer. I protest:

If a man must first be cast out of a particular Church before he can
out of the Catholique, then a man must first be a Member of a Particu-
lar before he can be of the Catholique Church: but the Antecedent is
true. Ergo,

Consequence is clear to me on this ground.

Ergo cannot see how he who is cast out of a particular Church, can
be cast out of the Catholique Church: if a man be first a Member of a
particular Church, and by virtue of this comes to have communion with
all other Churches, this is depending on the former, then the reason is
clear: cast him out of a particular Church you cast him out from all Com-
munion with others.

But a man he is a Member of the Catholique Church, and in being
a Member of this particular Church, depends upon it, when I see no rea-
sons: for though you have cast him out of your particular Church which is
second, yet his membership to the Catholique Church, which is first and
independent upon this, still remains: and you do in excommunication
but cast him into that state he was in before he joined to you. I think
still he is a Member of the Catholique Church, and may demand partake
aces elsewhere. Other Churches deny not communion before the particular
doth of which he is a Member, then they follow: hence their A.C. depends
on this it depends then not first.

This comes a little odd to me, a man is a Member of the Catholique
Church and yet he will require to be a Member of this Church, and another
Church he will require the Lords Supper, in another there he will want, to
be a member of all Churches in the world (if he could) and demand every
Ordinance, yet Member of no particular Church so that this man walks as
disorderly as he will (as the saying sometimes you give of a Church Mem-

Though ex-
communicated
unjustly, yet
till case be
heard, Com-
munion deny-
ed. *Small Can. 17.*

her will allow (and he is bad enough) in this Town or another Town, he have owned no particular Church, only the *Catholic*; what hath this particular Church to do to meddle with him more than any other? we must have *Catholic* Church-Officers to call him out, who are such; not only *deu prius* but *deu secundo*, which you say no Minister is to another that is not of his particular Congregation unless he be *called* to it, but to be sure this man will never call you to it, who then can give you a Call, so that this man cannot come to be reformed, and yet he may go up and down to any Church? I am a *Christian*, therefore give me the Ordinances, excommunicated I am not, for none can excommunicate him unless all the Officers of the Churches in the world should meet to call him out.

Which you
affirm, *Diatr.*
194.

If you say, *If he be first come to be baptized, of this particular Church he is a Member, and that Officer hath power, &c.*

No Sir, I cannot believe his doctrine, that my baptizing of another makes him member to our particular Church. I have had three of my children baptized by Ministers who never looked on me as member to their Church, though I dwell in the Town, I have done the same for others (being called to it), yet none of my members. Your self acknowledge, *Baptism doth not make a member of a visible Church.* Reviv. Mr. Hooker &c. then not of this particular visible Church.

So you express
your mind. *T.*
pag. 194 *Diatr.*

If you say, *But a Christian must not do thus, he must joine to a particular Church*; the question is not what he must do, but what he will do: will not you baptize his child or him unless he will joine? If not, you have said enough.

So you express
your mind. *T.*
pag. 194 *Diatr.*
Hooker, pag. 75
77.

3. To be a Church-member seems to be more than a *Christian*, i.e. a *Christian* member of such a Society and walking under such a policy; and that policy suppose Officers. You say there is no essential Homogeneity Church consisting without Officers, mentioned in the Scripture, is it so fast you say and repeat it again, opposing Mr. Hooker, a Church-member then must be under Officers, under such a policy, as in the Catholic Church, but how that can be unless he be a member of some particular Church (which is a member of the Catholic, as you say) I know not; the Catholic Church hath no policy, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*.

The hardest matter is the *Apostles* baptizing, which is often bladded, this makes me doubtful on the other side, only these thoughts of mine had.

1. They had such power as we have none, they could exercise their power any where without any call. Paul was an *Apostle* Officer to the Jews, and so other *Apostles* were the same, hence they could reach them in case of irregular wandering without a second Call, but so much cannot we.

2. I do not remember they baptized any single persons but such as were members of the Jewish Church, which was a Gospel Church under covenants. For others they baptized so many at once for ought I can see

that

that might lay the foundation of a particular Church; the Joyour will say, how many were in his house I know not; *Heard all his beasts belov'd in God.* So *Covenant*, there was company enough to begin a particular Church, for ought I can see, though how many its uncertain: *Paul and Peter Officers to these.* In beginnings some things may be extraordinary, as were they Officers extraordinary.

I easily see difficulties, if one or two Indians should seeme to be converted, but because their language cannot joyn to an English Church, should now the Minister delay to baptize him? but then there is this also, if one or two should prove vile and standious, what shall that Minister doe with him? other scruples about this I could saileing but it concerns not my question.

The next fault you finde is, *That requiring an explicate covenant to such a Church, I seeme not only to contradict my selfe, but also to unchurch most of our English Churches.*

Here I must stay a while, having occasion given to looke back into your Epistle. What doe I heare of contradictions againe? you have a strange Art in finding out contradictions: but how come this about? it seemes I require an *explicate Covenant*. But Sir, are you sure the word *explicate* is in the definition? nay, you are sure it is not: Can there be no Covenant in a Church but *explicate*? I suppose yes, and I suppose you thinke so also, so doe *Appellonius*, we will leave him speake presently, is this faire dealing to force a word upon me when I have clearly before expressed my selfe another way? I am faine enough then from contradictions, or from unchurching the Faithfull Congregations of England though they have not an *explicate Covenant*: your selfe p. 25. mention the *eternall Covenants of the Church*, but what you meane by it I know not.

You cite a passage in my Epistle which is this [*Some Ministers scorne the notion that an explicate Covenant is the forme of a Church visible, and some professors are so rigid for it that without it they deny all Churches*] of the late *serm. 2d.* Hooker, say you; Sir, you wrong him exceedingly, and I wonder a man of your grace should doe thus when he hath so expressly declared his minde to the contrary; to your knowledge the next words you mention shew as much, and in his Epistle p. 11. he speaks as plainly. But of him anon.

This passage shal cleare me from making no Churches but where there is an *explicate Covenant*; I saw in some Congregations where there were both visible and wall Saints (as we may judge) when the Lords Supper was to be administr'd, some professors would not joyn in the Ordinance for want of that (so farre as I could learne) supposing they were not in a right Church-way. Now this I could not approve of since there were so many Christians to depart from the Ordinance upon such a ground.

In my owne Congregation I thus practise; Some of other Parishes have desired to joyn with us at the Lords Supper; if we have not knowne them

well, I have desired them to bring a Testimony from their Ministers, and they have done so: Others whom we knew well I have not desired it, but admitted these to the Lords Supper, yet they were under no explicate Covenant, but an implicate Covenant, (I know they doct with their Pastors) in their Churches. If need had beene I would have baptized their children, had they brought them to me. I hope now you are convinced.

Afterward you say againe I recall it, because I said, [that this explicitness is almost essentiall to the government of the Church.]

Why doe you not take notice of the word *Almost*, which implies there may be some government without it? but it will not go on so strongly nor comfortably, but cast what you have said into a Syllogisme, and see how I recall it.

If explicitness of covenant be requisite to the esse of Church-government, then an explicate covenant is requisite to the esse formale of a Church.

But the Antecedent is true: Ergo, I see no reason for the Conclusion.

But for Church-government, try you what you can doe onely by vertue of their Christianity, and implicate Covenant, I have tryed it and found it not sufficient, but the other I have had good experience of. But for Church-covenant a few words.

First let us heare *Apollonius* speake who is a *Presbyter*.

Concedimus fœdus aliquod tacitum seu virtuale esse inter membra unius cujuscunque particularis Ecclesie externæ ac quo obligentur ad mutua illa officia præstanda quæ a membris Ecclesie visibiles ad particularem suam Ecclesiasticam Communionem exiguntur: quod nempe suis pastoribus eorum Curæ et disciplina subiacentium publicum divinum Cultum frequentare, eadem leges jurisdictionis Ecclesiæ gubernare velint: ex quo scedere etiam jus sibi acquirunt, ad illa quæ huic particulari Ecclesiæ ipsorum membris sunt propria, et aliis Ecclesiis particularibus non Competunt. This man speakes rationally, and those words are with the observation, *in quo fœdus sibi acquiritur, &c.* so that all the right and power that Officers or particular Churches have over their members arise from this Covenant: and this is certain, for suppose one be a Christian, and suppose he owne Church-Discipline, yet how doe I in particular come to be bound to dispense Baptisme or Lords Supper to him more then any other Minister? or how doe I and this Church in particular more then another come to have power over another in respect of Discipline, but by his covenanting, consenting (call it what you will) with us, and this Church, and not with another? for else he will say, though I doe owne Church-Discipline, yet who gave you power over me more then another Officer or Church?

For me to say you dwell in my Parish, is a silly answer, unless it can be proved that Parishes were by divine institution to such an end: there are none in my parish that come not to heare me, nor ever chose me to be their Officer, nor will owne the Church in this time of reformation, but I should

make it still a full man, yet dwell in the Parish, therefore you are bound to hear me, &c.

One word more about Parishes. I would put this question, it is a practise in England for a Patron to present, of late I know where a godly Minister is so chosen by the people, yet is being a Sequestration, the Incumbent dying, the gift fell into the hand of the Patron, he being an idle companion turned out the godly Minister, and put in another that is, &c. the people with one consent did declare against him, and opposed him at his coming, yet it seemes because the Law of the Land will have it so, this man is he that hath the place, but is he therefore their Pastour because he preaches in their Parish? I thinke it were strange for any man to asseert this, and this practise is very common: I hope the more parish doth not make him their Pastour, nor the people his Members. This is a wofull plague on godly people, and teach the way to Separation, though it will not justify others where the case is not the same.

Doctor Ames tells us of a *vinculum spirituale* which he calls Parity, and so as we may be rightly admitted into the Church, but by confession of Faith, and promise of Obedience. And this Apollinaris owns, pag. 13, 14.

The English Churches law something in it, that it was concluded upon in the Synods, that those who came to the Lords Supper, should promise expressly to be subject to Discipline: and had the Churches of England, the godly Officers (especially) made all those who came into their Parishes, and would have either Baptisme or Supper, to declare their choice of them for their Officers, and subjection to all Christs Ordinances, they might have had more strength against the Separation: indeed they have strength enough against most of them who have owned the Ministers, and constantly attended, and received the Ordinances from them, of which I have spoken elsewhere.

I Further, I should much desire that those who oppose the Church-Covenant, would lay down a Church-member in his essentiall causes, then they reach clearest: as for profession, Christianity [or what you will call it] this is but the *causa materialis* of a Church member, for it is not Man *quid sit* (for them all) but Man *quod professus*, as *salutis visibile*, this is the *materialis causa*, this then is not the *formalis causa*, for to have the same thing to be *Causa materialis* & *formalis respectu ejusdem effectus* is strange: therefore till I see a better I must say, that this Christians consenting or covenanting with this particular Church, and these Officers in it, to walke according to the Gospels &c. is the *formalis causa* of this Church-member.

In some sense we may say, the names doth distinguish things, a lump of Gold, from a lump of Clay differs materially: but one Golden vessel differs not from another, but *per formam*: Christians as visible Saints or Churches constituted of such, differ materially from all other Societies of Men, but how one Church, a Golden Candlestick differ from one another, but *per formam*, I know not, which is this that our Congregationall men speak of.

At 5. 13. Of the rest dost thou saye (non-Confederate) what was that which
 that glowed them to the Church? they were not feared from owning of
 Christ, or loving of the Disciples, they might hear the Apostles preach, &c.
 there was something expressed sure, much more now when so many
 Churches: the same word is used of the prodigall, Luke 15. 17. *and* *the*
 the Covenant between Master and Servant, is the glue that joynes each to
 other: so for ought I know it must be here.

Epistle.

You tell me, that the relation of Christians one to another, is not free but
 after a sort naturall, as that of Father and Child.

I was there speaking of Church-government, how we came to have
 power, &c. now it seems by you it is as naturall for any Christian to be un-
 der my power in particular, and this Church in particular, as for a child to
 be under his Fathers government, and I may naturally claim this official
 power over him, whether he will chooseth me or not, nay though he declare
 he will not own me for an officer, this is strange Doctrine. Is his relation
 to me Naturall (as I am an officer) or free?

As for the explicitnesse of the Covenant, I have seen so much order and
 comelinesse in Churches by reason of it, that if I can ever attaine it I will,
 and so would M. Gaudry, had he seen what I have seen in N. England, yet
 I will not shill all Churches for want of an explicite Covenant. I can dis-
 tinguish between *esse* and *melius esse*.

Vindici. Carb.
 pag. 19.

M. Hudson shall winde up all: I deny not (saith he) but mutual consent of
 persons within such a Vicinity, to joyn together constantly in the Ordinances of
 God, under the Inspection of such and such officers, is requisite to a particular
 Congregation.

Now give me leave to examine a little what you have writ against sever-
 rand M. Hooker, since the providence of God hath joyned me with so holy
 and learned a man (O that I had his Mantle) much of his discourse falls in
 with mine, and so your answers to him serve against me, but that part I
 shall let alone.

Survey part 3.
 pag. 11, 12.

His Question is this, Whether persons non-confederate, and so (in our sense) not Members of the
 Church, doe enstrie their children to the state of Baptisme, being one of the
 priviledges of the Church, their Parents (though godly) being yet unwilling to
 come into Church-fellowship?

You make very great use of these words, that persons non-Confederate are
 in his sense no Members of a Church: now Sir, let me move one question;
 Whether only persons that are in explicite Confederacy are to be esteemed
 in M. Hookers sense Members of a Church? if M. Hooker have expressed
 the contrary, as he hath most fully, pag. 47, 48. of his first part, and in Pre-
 face, pag. 11. where he saith expressly, The Faithfull Congregations in
 England are *our* Churches, then that cannot be M. Hookers sense. In pag. 47,
 48. he shewes how the Covenant is acted after a double manner; Explicitly
 and Implicitly, and there shewes how it is acted in the Churches of Eng-
 land. Then adds,

This

that Mr. H. cannot be ignorant of our opinion and well known opposition : and I would interest the Reader to observe once for all : that if he must needs such satisfactions [such an answer to Mr. Cawdrey] that we multiply all Churches besides our own ; that upon our grounds received there must be no Churches in the world, but in New-England, or some few (observe this) set up lately in Old : that we are rigid Separatists, &c. subdister clamour, a wise meek spirit passeth by them, as an unworthy and ungrounded assertion, &c. then shewes that Implicite and Explicite are but Adjuncts of the Covenant : and in some cases an Implicite Covenant may be fully sufficient : could any man living speak more clearly then Mr. Hooker ? and could any man living speak more perversely then Mr. Caw. that Mr. Hooker deny all Churches where there is not an explicite Covenant ?

Epistle to Sed.
Answ.

To returne to his question : Two things I desire the Reader to observe in it :

1. By persons non-Confederate, he doth not mean godly Parents that are not confederate explicite, but if they be members of true Churches, walking in Church fellowship though there be not an explicite Covenant, but implicite, Mr. Hooker doth not looke on these as falling under his question, so have nothing to doe with such now. This is most cleare by what I have alledged out of him.

Hence there is not one syllable of the word explicite put into the question : and afterwards [the same page] when Mr. Hooker shewes why he inclineth to the negative, being moved thereto from the nature of the Church-Covenant : he doth not say explicite Church-covenant. Yet see how Mr. Cawdrey interprets these words, that is, indeed the necessity of an explicite Covenant, and in page 144. he hath stated the question thus : [Whether the Infants of Believers not in Covenant explicite with a particular visible Church, may be baptized ?] This is none of Master Hooker's question.

Diary. 185.

Hence first, those arguments which Mr. Cawdrey hath drawn up in his Diary, with Mr. Hooker from the Infants of the godly Members of our Churches here in England, they all labour with the disease called, Ignoratio Elench, for he hath changed the question, and doth not speake ad idem.

2. Hence secondly, all that paines Mr. Cawdrey spends to prove that Children may be baptized by virtue of Grandfather, or Adoption, [if he can make it out that they may be so] yet if such a Grandfather or person who Adopts, be confederate, and walk in Church-fellowship (though not explicite Confederate) this doth not trouble Mr. Hooker's question : if that Grandfather, or person who Adopts, be not Confederate, then the question falls upon them indeed, not else.

Mr. Hooker's question then concerns only such godly Parents as are Members of no particular visible Church, and being no Members but coming in joyne with a Church ; now the question will be, what explicite-ness may be required.

Act 5. 13.
There was a
Church, and
joyning to it I
doubt not be-
fore the Apo-
stles would
baptise.

Diary. p. 100.
Mr. Stone
knew his mind,
vid. ch. 5.

B. efacc, p. 11.

The second thing I observe in his question is, *That the godly Persons are unwilling to come into Church-fellowship*; and hereby the pinch of the question. But this plainly implies *That Church-fellowship is to be bad, and that person is required by him to whom he offers his Child to be baptized, to joyne in Church-fellowship*: if Church-fellowship be not to be bad, then how shall his willingness or unwillingness be knowne? let there be an object *bonum* or *malum* which he will should chuse or reject. Hence then if there could be no answer else given to what Mr. C. urgeth from the *Jaylor*, who was baptized though not confederate, this troubles not the question, if there were no Church which did require him to joyne in fellowship; had there been a Church in *Philippi*, and *Paul* had required him to joyne in fellowship with the Church, and the *Jaylor* would not, then indeed Mr. C. had brought something against Mr. *Hooker*, if *Paul* would have baptized him.

But yet Mr. C. will force it upon Mr. *Hooker* that he must mean it of an *explicite Confederacy* whether he will or no, yea though he hath expressly spoken to the contrary: but what is his ground? This.

In N. England (saith he) *They refuse to admit either our Members (though godly) to the Lords Supper, or their Children to Baptisme, unless they enter their expresse Covenant*: This is the ground.

One passage I observe, you call the godly Ones *our Members*, but doe you look upon them as *your Members*, who are gone 3000. miles from you; never to see you more, where you can never have any inspection over them; let them walke as they will? I am sure they doe not thinke you are their Officers, nor doe call you so, how then they should be still your Members I cannot tell: let therefore Mr. *Hooker* speak for himselfe, and out of him I will give you an answer, and shew you the reason is not as you say: Mr. *Hooker* thus, *The faithfull Congregations of England are true Churches; Members that come commended from such Churches to ours here, so that it doth appere to the judgement of the Church whence they come, that they are by them approved and not scandalous; they ought to be received to Communion with us, as Members of other Churches with us in New England, in like case so commended and approved*. Hence then Sir, is the plain reason, the people that see from hence, doe quite depart from these Churches, so that they never come more under the Inspection of the Officers and Church: here they never bring Lettices testimoniall from you, to shew they are Members first with you, and approved by you, and so commended; as saith Mr. *Hooker* to those Churches there, but thither they come free from all Churches (even in their own account) and there let them walke as they will; there are no Churches have power to reach them, unless they will joyne themselves to one there, as they have disjoynd themselves from your Churches here. But now make this tryall, let there go out of the faithfull Congregations of England, persons whose interest is not to disjoyne themselves from you, unless they go to Churches as some other brand; let the godly Officers of such Congregations, give a certificate under their hands, *sub po-*

soni

feare that now by coming to you in New England, we shall perforce, Mem-
bers of our Churches, and walk in Church-fellowship with us, and this orderly,
though we have no expresse Covenant; we desire such may for the time of their
abode with you, be admitted to the Lords Supper, if a Child be borne to them,
let it be baptiz'd: and those persons when they come there walk according-
ly, I say try the Ministers there, and I dare warrant you such persons shall
not be denyed Communion though you have not an expresse Cove-
nant.

And here Sir they require no more of you, then they will give; for if
any who are Members of their Churches should come over from them hi-
ther, and bring no Letters of recommendation to the Churches here, shew-
ing that they are Members with them there, and walk approvedly among
them, if such should require the Lords Supper or Baptisme here, if you
will refuse them [unlesse they will shew or make it out, that they are
Members there, and walk orderly, (onely their occasions call them hither
now for a time) or will joyne with you if they have left those Churches]
the Churches there will not be displeased with you: therefore the Mem-
bers that come from thence bring Letters of recommendation with them,
shewing what I have said before, and desiring of Churches here their care
over them while here they abide. And now you have the plaine rea-
son.

But one word more: pag. 29. you speak against those who meddle with
other Ministers charges: those who go to New England you call your Mem-
bers, should then the Ministers of New England baptize, and excommuni-
cate (out of what Church I know not but yours, for of theirs they are no
Members) your Members, they should meddle with your charge, and doe
a strange act to excommunicate your Members when your selfe doe not,
this is more then *Classicall* or *Episcopall* power.

But here you will charge Master Hooker with a Contradiction:
because hee seems to bee against this practise, that Members of one
Congregation should partake of the Sacraments in another Congrega-
tion.

Had Mr. Hooker lived to have filed over his work againe, I do believe he
would have considered this place again; but the other places are most plain.
Yet something may be said for him.

That Master Hooker should be against the giving of the Sacrament to
a Member of another Congregation, who hath occasion to be absent from
his own, and is commended and approved by his own Church, this I can-
not believe.

I will give you my reason. A neer friend of mine in New England living
divers miles from Mr. Hooker, had occasion to be in his Towne on the
Sabbath: my friend being a Minister [I cannot tell whether at that time in
Office or no to the Church, in the Towne where belived] Mr. Hooker got
him to preach in the forenoone in his Church; at that time there was a
Sacrament in the Church; my friend when he had done preaching (being

and opposed to his spirit) went down out of the Desert, and would not have stayed the Sacrament, but Mr. How kept after him, and clasp hold on his shoulder, and pulled him back againe; and made him stay the Sacrament: my friend told me it was the best Sacrament that ever he enjoyed.

This practice of his cleare him from Contradiction, and therefore that cannot be his meaning.

This then I presume is his true meaning: it was the practice of divers of us in N. E. at the first planting we did joyne our selves to this or that Church; afterwards when other Plantations were erected, for convenience of dwelling, (the former Plantations being too full) we would remove and dwell there, retaining still our membership in those churches to which we first joyined, and by vertue of it having letters of recommendation, did partake of the Sacraments in those churches where we lived, and hence divers members lived many miles, twenty or sixty from their owne churches, and from the inspection of those officers who had power to call them to account; and observe their Conversations, and yet would partake of the Sacraments sixe or eight yeeres together in another Congregation; this indeed he opposed, in so much that when I came away the Elders would not suffer it any longer: this is but rationall, and this I conceive is his true meaning.

Here then as I said is all the question; whether or no if a godly man be member of no particular Church, and comes to demand baptism; may not I require him first, if you will have baptism, (being it is a church priviledge, and christians ought to walke orderly,) then joyne to some particular church.

Or so if there
be more Officers
then one.

If you require it of me, then may not the officer demand, doe then you choose me as your officer, to whom you will submit under Christ? doe you looke on this particular church as a true church of Christ, and will you walke with the members of it according to Christs rule? will you subject to all Christs ordinances? I pray why may I not demand these? Consider what *Apollonius*, *Ames*, *Mr Hudson* have said, the light of nature will carry as much; for if this man will not owne me for his officer, if he will not joyne with the Church, if not submit to Ordinances, what reason have I in particular to baptize his Child, or I and the Church in particular to take more care of him then any other Church? if you say by his requiring baptism of me he professes all this; no Sir, by no means, I have answered this already: and he may doe as some have done with me, that have required baptism of me, and have confessed to me that Discipline was an Ordinance of God, but to promise subjection to it, and to me with the Church that we in particular should have power over them, they would not do it, and could tell me that I had no power over them without their consent; and they speak truly, for they had not chosen me for their officer, though they are in the parish, and by their Christianity I could claime no power over them more than another Minister.

So that if you will yield me this, we shall as fast prove that explicit consent will be necessary at the first admission.

Thus Sir I think you have a full answer to your *Diarie*, with Mr. Hooker, as to the point of Confederacy, with what I have said I thinke to wipe off all your Arguments, as to that point, I doe not run over all, because my booke will swell into too big a volume; for the other things in the *Diarie*, they concerne me with him. Now then I, proceed.

In p. 4. you tell me our Arguments for Infants-Baptisme stand upon the notion of an Explicite Covenant. How true this is, let the Reader judge.

Then you tell me I have mistaken *Anselm* his argument for Infants Baptisme, [because Children are capable of the grace of Baptisme, for all are *Parientis*, &c.] this is brought you say to answer the objection of the *Anabaptists*; what you tell me of thofe is no newes: but I pray see if Doctor *Ames* be answering an objections hee makes: his fifth argument: see also Mr. *Masball* his Sermon upon Infants Baptisme. p. 41. 43. I know it serves against an objection, and yet consider the child with the parent, it may serve for a ground also for Baptizing.

Then you tell me I speake not properly, because I put a *Morality* in the Command to *Abraham* &c.] Sir you may well know by the next words I did but borrow the word from the morality of the second commandment which I had used for illustration: and is there onely *Analogy* in it, when we see the Command is not repeated, but rather confirmed in the New Testament? but I perceive your scope is to spy out what faults you *Acts 1. 38, 39.* can, though they do not concerne the question, and sometimes when you can finde none, yet you will makesome.

Then you bring me to the question about predecessors, which you have largely discussed in the *Diarie*, you say, for that promise in the second Commandment you say you would not plead it.

Sir then you doe not help my adversaries at home, who have pleaded onely that promise, and therefore I onely mentioned this, not having seen your booke.

Before I come to see what you have said, let me speake one word, as to the question, whether if a godly grand-father being of the Church, and being Orthodox [you put it in thus twice in one page, godly, living, Orthodox] should bring a grand-child to me, so baptize it by vertue of his making it so himself, *Diatr. 187.* and as his own, and engaging for the Education of it, whether now I should refuse it? so in this p. 7. truly I cannot tell: it is a hard question, and because I see so many godly, holy learned men, and some also Congregational men are of that Opinion, I am the more shaken, thinking God will reveale more to them then to such a wretch as I am, but I am not resolved what I should doe, if I were put upon the practise.

But suppose I yield this, yet you trouble me not at all but give my question, for if I baptize it now it is the immediate seed of chiefe Scandalous parents, but the mediate seed of a godly grand-father or grand-

another, who take it as theirs, and engage for Education, then I doe not Baptize the children of such, as the question mentions by virtue of them. This will serve to take off many of your Answers.

But then I come againe, What shall I doe with the Infants of such whose parents are such as the Q. mentions, and so are, and were their progenitors? I have divers such, of whom I have enquired.

Thus then I could easily depart from this, but for discourse sake, to beat it out more clearly, I will try what you have said.

The text you give me is *Gen. 17. 7.* and in this p. and p. 11, you require of me an *expresse Scripture* that shews, the promise reach but to the next generation. What meanes you by this? do you look on me as an *Anabaptist*? when I dispute against them I take their owne principles, but doe you therefore require it of me? I doubt you have not given *expresse Scriptures* for all you have said in your books. Nay Sir, (which is strange) if you will prove the Grandfather might circumcise the Grandchild, if the immediate parent had lost his right [which come neereſt to our Q.] you must draw it out by consequence: I pray call for no more then you give.

Because you speak of your full and large discussing of this question in your *Diary*. I made account you had bestowed much paines upon the text to prove it out, and cleare the text, but I see you onely propound the text, and no more. It is worth the paines sometimes to cleare out a text, which you have not done; that which looks most likely is, that you say, *Jacob had power to dispose of Josephs Children*; you might have set downe a Text: if you meane *48. Gen. 5.* the *6. v.* will help to an answer, * and as for the *5. v.* if you please to peruse famous *Rivers* on the Text, who clearly opens it; I cannot see how any thing can be drawne from thence to your purpose, to prove it by any thing else you have said, I can see nothing.

But to the Text: *I will establish my Covenant betweene me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.*

1. Its true, God made his Covenant not onely with *Abraham*, but his seed after him. His seed, either 1. Such as were *Carnally* and *Spiritually*. So *Jacob*, *David*, &c. who were really within the Covenant of grace. 2. Or his seed onely *Carnally*. So those ten Tribes when revolted, and the Jewes when went whoring after Gods; not cleaving to the God of *Abraham*; 3. Who onely *Spiritually* not *Carnally*: So the believing *Proselytes* then, and believing *Gentiles*: which I conceive may be subdivided, into his seed really so, or wisely so, that in judgement of charity appeare so, but not truly so. So some of the Jewes also, as well as *Gentiles*.

2. He saith *Hee will be a God to them*, those who were really and spiritually *Abrahams* seed, had him for their God indeed: for other he was a God so to them as he owned them only of all nations to be his Church, giving to them his Statutes and Ordinances; they also *His holy People*, i. e. separated from other people.

Diary. 188.
The issue which
about legatess
after them shall
be thine.

3. I bele true, God did hold this Covenant with them, he did not cast off his Seede in the 6. or 10. generation, and take in another Seede to make his Church, so long as that People was to endure.

4. However the Covenant for the substance was given to *Adam*, yet I conceive (under favour) it was not drawne formally into a Covenant before now: (*Noahs* Covenant was a Covenant with the Creature as well as with Man.) Hence God appoints a Signe and Seale of this Covenant.

Covenants use to be sealed, not bare promises. This Seale is to be administered to *Abrahams* seed who were taken into Covenant.

The Question is, whether this Seale of the Covenant was to be administered to the seed of *Abraham* as such; i. e. onely Naturally so, though they had changed their God, who was *Abrahams* God, and worshipped such Gods as *Abraham* abhorred: though they had plainly rejected the Covenant, 2 Kings 17. from 8. to 18. v. though they were worse then the Heathen; 2 Kings 11. 9. 11. so that nothing of the Covenant appeared in them, or was to be administered to such (as visible at least) did walke as *Abraham* their Father did? If that be true which *Maimony* quoted by *Ainsw.* say it should seem so. It is a generall rule, that he onely is *Abrahams* seed, that retaineth his Law, and his Right way: and these are they that ought to be Circumcised: If none else, then they did ill in Circumcising abundance; but for ought I can learn out of the chapter, *Abrahams* seed; as such, though onely his seed according to the flesh were to be Circumcised.

5. Upon this I cannot see, but that any Child whose Father was of *Abrahams* seed, might as well be Circumcised, by vertue of a Predecessour who was *Abrahams* seed, though he were dead six hundred years before, yea by vertue of *Abraham* himselfe (and that is most likely) as well as by vertue of a Grandfather.

6. It seemes a vaine thing to talke of a Grandfather giving Right to Circumcision, in case the immediate parent had forfeited his right (as our question would intimate) for if we consider who were to administer this Circumcision, and the immediate parent being of *Abrahams* seed, it should seem there is no room for such a thought.

Those who did administer it were their Parents, Magistrates, or Masters, (if Servants) yea themselves (by *Maimony*, when wax'n great, if the thing were hid from the Judges, yea learned *Rivers* agrees with *Absen*, who said women as well as men, so say others) whom I could quote, there was none designed of God to the work; and still among the Jewes, he that can doe it most neatly be administer it, whom they call *Mohel*; and he practises first upon the children of poorer sort of Jewes, then others.

This speaks plainly to me that it is vaine to talke who gave Right there, it appears plain enough.

But come to us: *Believers* onely are *Abrahams* seed; the flesh hath nothing to doe here, there must be flesh as a substration that's true, or else there can be no Believer, but not such flesh that comes from *Abraham*.

Believing

Sir I pray
prove this that
ever any did so.

It was my 9th.
Argument,

p. 12.
Ainsw.
Gen. 17. 13.

Bucer. Synag.
Jud. c. 3.

believing Gentiles, such as *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, &c. were esteemed his seed, and with these God makes his Covenant, these have the Seale administered, and their Children, God is a God to them also, takes them into his visible Church, and appoints the Seale for them: but if these Children grow up and make, it plainly appears that they reject the Covenant of their Fathers, and they prove contumacious, these cease to be *Abraham's* seed, the *Seal* here will not help them: whilst Infants they were esteemed his, but now they declare the contrary; if then they declare openly they are not his seed, how can they give uile to the Seale of the Covenant which they have rejected?

Had this Covenant (the Seale I meane) beene to be administered to *Abraham's* spiritual seed only, so that if any of his carnall seed had manifested a rejection of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, then they had forfeited their right; had it beene committed to the Priests or Levites to administer with a seare that it were not abused; and could it be made cleare that the immediate parent might forfeit his right, and then the Grandfather gave the Title; then there were good arguing from hence; but those things are yet to prove. Dath God say to any believing Gentile, *I will be the God of thee and thy seeds, in many Generations, though thy seeds cast me off?* But I will come to argument.

1. If the Grandfather by vertue of this promise can give the Title to Baptisme, then the Children of *Carpocrates*, *Marcion*, *Valentinus* [let us suppose these mens parents to be godly and Church Members, and these Hereticks to have Children] ought to be baptised.

But the Consequent is false. Ergo, the Antecedent is false!

If you say, that if their Grandfathers were living, and would take those Children, and educate them, it is true they might.

I pray Sir why doe you tie up the Text to living Grandfathers, there is nothing like it in the Text: let the Grandfathers be living or dead, there is nothing in the Text: if they were godly or Heretick, there is nothing, they were *Abraham's* seed according to the flesh.

There is nothing neither of a Grandfather taking the Grandchild to himselfe, still they were *Abraham's* seed; neither can I discerne how you can draw it out by necessary consequence.

If you say they are Apostates and so have no right: Say the Text speaks not of *Abraham's* seed, if they doe not Apostatize, you know they did so, and yet were circumcised; and that by vertue of a grandfather's approbation. Such a Christ as these Hereticks phansied they did owne: so for *Arrianus*, *Phutianus*, they will owne a Christ.

To. 494. loc.

com. To. 4648.

For the Baptizing of Hereticks children, you have *Waleus* against you, and *Gerhard*, he claue they put in, if the Heretick say they will bring up their children in their Heresie is but needlesse, as if Hereticks would not doe so: what they say for this I can turne as well against scandalous living; but I shall not trouble my selfe.

6. *The 1st promise [I will be the God of thee and thy seed] reached not
 only to the next Children, but their posterity in a second or third generation:
 then you make an &c. that is true as I have said before, and it troubles not
 me: but now under the Gospel to how many generations will this extend,
 that the Grandfather shall give title to Baptisme? you name the *third* and
 then adde, &c. How many doe you include in *&c. cetera*: thus you have
 spoken in another place, and there another &c. It is indeed usuall to put *Diatr. p. 106.*
 an &c. when mens mindes are clearly knowle, and there is no matter of *112.*
 consequence attended upon it, so spare our writing, and the Printer; but
 if any matter of consequence depends, then it is very poore to put in *&c.*
cetera, you know &c. in the Bishops Oath was an untoward thing, and
 here it is a troublesome thing; if to the *third*, why not to the 103. genera-
 tion? *&c. cetera* will go further. But say you p. 11. *this is their common*
Objection, [his head is very shallow that should not reach it] but you have *fully*
answered it elsewhere: Come on then Sir, since you say you have *fully*
 answered it, I will turne to your *Distrube*, and there looke for it, supposing
 that a man of your parts who doth slight so extreemly other mens argu-
 ments, calling them *very weak*, &c. when you say you answer *fully*, you
 have done so indeed; in p. 112. I see you have it there to answer. I per-
 ceive you finde it a troublesome objection, and there rectie the opinions of
 some men, whom I honour as much as your selfe, if there were nothing
 but an opinion of a man to be desired: you summe up their opinions, and
 it amounts to this, *It seems that the Children of Christians knowne or pre-*
sumed to be such, whether living or dead, may be baptised: then you give us
 an allusion from those who could not prove their Genealogy. *Ezra 2. 62*:
 Whether you will stand to this as your answer I know not: but then you
 adde, *But all the Children of knowne Believers*, Christians, Orthodox and yet
 living, *whether next or remoter may seeme to challenge a right to Baptisme*: this
 is the full answer; but twice you use the word *seeme*, which shewes you ra-
 ther propounding your opinion modestly, but I pray Sir doe not say this is *so*
fully answered, it is no answer at all, (it is your opinion indeed) for by all
 the discourse I have met with as yet in that book, you have not proved that
 living Grandfathers may give a title, onely you propound a text, which
 will prove the *dead* as well as the *living* may give a title if a Grandfather as
 all may: if you meane no more then the living Grandfather, your *&c. cetera*
ra will soone be run out.*

In p. 8. you meet with an argument of mine which is this, [*"If the wicke-
 kednesse of the immediate parent cut him off from the Lords Supper;
 though his parent be godly, why doth not the same wickednesse cut him
 off from giving right to his childes Baptisme? if the parent cannot
 claime one Seale of the Covenant for himselfe, appearing plainly
 not to have the condition of it, must not the child suffer who depends
 upon him for its title? The parent suffers, therefore the child must
 needes.*

*You say no, not for Temporall punishments [Gehazi, Achan, Corah, &c. their
 children*

children did] not *perish*. To this *Indifferent* [they cannot] be abstracted from their parents to this, and therefore may: as the child comes to have its right by a parent, so the child may lose by a parent: it doth not lose salvation nor regeneration by it.

You answer 4. waies: 1. From the *feare*; which doth not avale with me, there was something peculiar to them in administration of Circumcision, as is cleare before, and shall be made cleare hereafter.

2. Your second is the distinguishing betweene a persons generall state and personall wickednesse; *his state is a christian, &c.*

I answer; if you meane by personall wickednesse, some particular falls (as you bring in Noah and David strangely afterward) I think so indeed; but if you meane a continued seiled course in wickednesse, wilfull ignorance then I say; such a person hath lost his first right to his owne or his child's baptism [you may call him a *Christian*, but let his *Christianity* be such as you have said may qualifie him for a Church-Member, or else it is not worth a rush.] Such a one I looke at as one that ought to be excommunicated, for he deserves it, (we must prove that persons ought to be excommunicated before they are.) Now since he ought, the question is, why he is not? [if he be, the child suffers for his state being a non-Member] in *fero Dei* he is, and ought to be in *fero Ecclesiastico*: if the case stand so as through the multitude of such, it cannot conveniently be so. Then yet let the Ministers go as farre as they can. I pray Sir let this satisfie to your answers which you give about Excommunication; for you would gather from me, *that still Excommunication, Ministers ought to baptise*.

Thus far I yeild it, till Excommunication, or that which doth deserve Excommunication, so that the persons ought to be excommunicated, though from some other externall impediments (as multitude, &c.) they cannot be excommunicated; yet then a separation from such, or non-*communion* may help.

3. You say, *you have largely confuted this notion of the immediate parent*: I think not so.

4. You say, *I have destroyed it my self*: the right he hath is one by the Churches toleration, let the Officers looke to that; the first and maine right hee hath none, and none at all according to your doctrine.

For p. 9. the distinction of the *Physical* and *Moral* right in *Diarr.* 188. if you had strongly proved the *Moral* right of the Grandfather would clearely have taken off that wrong meane. Sir I. will receive an answer when I see I am answered. But that there should be as little right of the Mother over the Child when compared with her Husband, as is of the Grandfather compared with the Father (which you would seeme to intimate) is strange, I am sure the Mother communicates as much and more to the being of the Child, then the Father doth.

For *adquisit*, he may enjoy his opinion, yet I think *Chamier* (of whom anon),

...is not such a thing. But upon this supposition, your conclusion, is it well
 If nothing worke thus have come from you.

Then you tell me I renew my plea, which is this [*That who shall educate
 this child? the Ignorant person cannot, the Scandalous teach it how to
 breake the Covenant, Professors are dead, &c.*] Here first you tell me
*of a Law of the Land, which hath taken care for the education of Papists Children,
 and Orphans, providing Schooles and Hospitalls.* Hence first I gather, you doe
 not care whether the Grandfather be living or dead, which in another place
 you expresse otherwise; here the immediate grossly ignorant and scandalous
 persons give title: but for what you say, I pray pardon my ignorance of
 the Lawes that have been so many yeares out of England; I did not know
 the Scare had made such a Law, *That if an Ignorant or Scandalous Parent have
 a child baptised, then those who are knowing and godly men (as least sober men,
 conversion comely) should take the child, and bring it up, and instruct it in the
 Covenant of grace,* which must be the answer or nothing; this were wofull
 trouble, if good People or visible Saints should be thus charged with all the
 children of persons who are as the question mentions: As for the other
 part, you say, *The Church should take care, as in case both the Parents dye whilest
 they are little Children;* and then you give a nip to the *Congregational Church*:
 you say right for the Churches care, but how shall we doe whilst these
 parents live and keepe them at home, and teach them to breake Covenant,
 and though they are intreated to send their children to catechising, yet will
 not, as I have too bad experience? For the children of Church members,
 the parents dying whilst they are young, I wish I could see as good examples
 of your parochiall Cnogregations taking care for the Christian education
 of such, as I could give you in the Congregational Churches in New
 England, but then the title was not questioned, there was that ease,
 and wee did not know but those godly parents might live to educate them.

Page 10.

Then p. 11. you turne an argument upon me from my selfe, [*because I
 could stand a promise by vertue of my Father, so may the Grandchild by vertue of
 a godly Grandfather, and so bid me change Parents into Progenitors.*] Sir I am
 glad I could give you so good an argument, and I could betraime to let it
 alone, for it will not hurt my question, as I said before. Onely a word, you
 bid me change *Parents* into *Progenitors*; so I will, let it be the great Grand-
 father of the childes great Grandfather, and one that is fourty generations
 before him, for your *&c. &c.* will give me leave, (I know not how to set
 bounds to *&c. &c.*) yet I may goe so farre for a title, and the text you
 bring doth not limit me.

Page 11.

You grant an *Apostate* loseth his owne baptisme, p. 12. so his right is
 cut off; suppose the *pro-parents* be dead here is *interciso Christianisme* as
 you quoted *Calvin* before, then I know not how this *Apostates* child can
 be Baptized, by any parentall right: yet if this child should come to under-
 standing, and there should be movings on the heart of it, and it should plead
 the Covenant of a Grandfather [I should not question to baptise it with-
 out respect to parents if it came so that.] Yet Sir, this will shew there is a

Yet you can-
 not see how a
 parents Apo-
 stacy can just-
 ly cut off his
 child. *Diss.*

p. 190.
 great

great difference between the *pro-parents* right [if it can clearly be proved at all] giving a title to baptism, and the immediate parents, for that may be cut off by the immediate parent justly, but the immediate parents title cannot be cut off.

Page 12, 13.

Now we are come to the last Argument.

It by vertue of the Grandfather, then the child of one Apostatiz'd or excommunicated person may be baptized: but not *Ergo*.

For an Apostate you tell me of the kindred taking care of it, or *successores*: this notion will come in afterwards.

For excommunicated persons there you bestow paines, and I perceive you care not so much for a *pro-parent* here, but by vertue of the immediate parent himselfe though excommunicated.

For my owne part I should not here yeeld to a *pro-parent*, neither doe I see our *New England* Divines (that could betecome a Grandchild under the Grandfathers tuition to be baptized by vertue of him) will allow, if the immediate parents be excommunicated, for this hinders the working of the Ordinance; it is of greater force to worke when a man shall see not only himselfe cut off, but even his very children also, this hath beene a means to awaken some in *N. England*, who were not excommunicated, but only not admitted, to see their posterity also suffer for their sakes, it hath so wrought as to make (some truly godly (so farre as we may judge) and others it hath brought into externall order in conversation.

But since you have here maintained it by vertue of the immediate parent excommunicated, I shall desire to consider it.

It is granted there is a difference betweene an excommunicated person and a Heathen. As

Revic. M. Hoo. 1. He may still hold his profession: [*but as you say, it is violated by his scandall, and it must be renewed before he can be received againe.*] Though he holds his profession still, yet that now violated is not sufficient to give himselfe a title to Baptisme if he were not now baptized, much lesse the child who depends wholly on his title.

119.

If his profession be sufficient to give his child by vertue of him a title to one Seale of the Covenant, why the same profession should not be sufficient to give himselfe a title to the other Seale of the Covenant, [one faith being the condition of it, and you say he hath that,] I can see no reason.

That profession which is not sufficient to make a man a Church member, is not sufficient to give title to a Church priviledge, consequently not to baptism.

But the profession of a person excommunicated is not sufficient, &c. *Ergo* the Minor is cleare: his profession is violated, and must be renewed before he can be received, say you. Then tis not sufficient.

This is further cleare, for if it be sufficient to make him a Church member when cast out, why was it not sufficient to keepe him within.

(157)
within whilst he was within? so he should not have needed to be cast out.

This then is cleare, that there is great difference betweene the profession of a person who was never admitted, and another who is cast out: the first may have lesse knowledge by faare, weaker gifts and possibly more infirmities which may yet be such, as a Church may admit, when the other who hath violated his profession, may not.

2. He is under cure, but his cure is *non-membership*, a member cut off from the body: a Heathen is not under cure.

3. When he hath renewed his profession by repentance, and so the Church received him againe, he is not re-baptised: but this doth not prove that therefore whilst he is *extra Ecclesiam*, that he can give title to a privilege of the Church: it is not his being baptised that is the ground of his childs baptisme whilst he is in the Church, therefore that cannot give the title when he is out of the Church.

But Heathens must be baptised when they are admitted: the other is received again, not therefore baptised. That his baptisme is not the ground of his childs baptisme, I shall prove afterward.

But I will come to Argument.

1. If a child may be baptise by vertue of an excommunicated parent, then that parent is not excommunicated; and this is to make a contradiction.

But the parent is excommunicated. Ergo.

To baptise is to give Communion, *baptised into one body*, then there is 1 Cor. 12. 13. Communion given with the body, by an excommunicated person: is not this a contradiction? Communion is most properly seene in Baptisme and Lords Supper.

What is excommunication, saith M. Rutherf. *but to deny all Communion with those who were once in the Church?* but all Communion is not here denied. Peac: plea 111

You will object, as you answer, pag. 13. *All Communion with himself, but not with the child, for that is borne a Christian, and so hath right.*

Ans. Hath the child right to Communion any other way with the Church then by the parent? is it not he that brings him in as a branch of himself? is it not a Christian borne by vertue of the parents Christianity? but his parents Christianity can give him selfe no title to Church-priviledges, as I said before of *profession*, which is all one. Doth the child plead a title distinct from the parent? if so, then your answer you give were something, but I know of no title it hath but the parents, who expresses his own title for himselfe and his seed. Now it is very rationally, that if the child have Communion given onely by vertue of the parents Communion, [for before the parent was admitted a Church-member the child could have none] then the parent having forfeited Communion for himselfe, must needs forfeit it for his depending child also.

What *Tertullian* saith of Excommunication, *Apol. c. 39.* and *1. ad uxorem* you know.

Aug. 9. 75.

If the Church had been a Church, though her husband were cast out, we doe not approve his practice who would not baptize his child by vertue of her; but it seems they apprehended that there was some equitie if both were cast out. No wonder though *Augustine* were againe it upon his principle.

2. If excommunication be the casting out of a member of a Church, 1 Cor. 5. ult. and consequently rendring him a non-member, then an excommunicated person cannot give title to his child's Baptisme.

But excommunication is casting a man out &c.

The consequence is cleare, how can one who is a non-member of a Church give title to a Church-priviledge?

Excommunication renders him a non-member, cutting him off from Communion, and admitting him to no other Ordinances then a non-member is.

The phrase, *cast out*, shewes he is no Member.

Aug. 10d. l. l. c. 5.

So the phrase of *cutting off*, which learned *Gilliespy* hath excellently opened to be meant of Excommunication, and there brings in *Buxtorf*. and *Godwin*, who report out of the *Rabbins*, that their children were not circumcised. This you say, pag. 14. is not Orthodox, and is was a corrupt Invention of the latter Jews having no ground for it in the Scripture: you say elsewhere, I thinke in the *Diss.* that the Scripture doth not speak for nor against it, so far as you can see; but then Sir what ever I make of it, it concerns you to prove it to be a corrupt invention, though I could yeild it from what I observed before of their Circumcision, and yet not hurt my selfe.

But you answer to this Argument, p. 13. *That he is a member still, though much diseased*; he was much diseased before, whilst under Church admonitions, suspensions, and because those Medicines would not cure him he was cut off; *a member under cure*, say you, his cure is non membership.

But this is pretty, a man shall be cut off the body, and yet be a member of the body; a man shall be cast out of the Church, and yet shall be within the Church; a man shall be no member of a Church, as say you p. 24. and p. 14. and yet be a member of a Church; how you who are so Eagle-eyed to spie out contradictions in other men will now cleare your selfe, I cannot tell. *Member, no Member*, are *contradictoria* I thinke, and to find a *medium in contradietibus* is new Logick to me, I thought *euius non ens* had admitted none.

1 Cor. 5.

3. Excommunication is the putting of a man out of the visible Kingdome of Christ, into the Kingdome of Satan. So the best Expolitors I meet with, Master *Carrwright*, &c. expounds *that delivering up to Satan*.

Hence I argue, To administer the Scale of the Covenant to a child by vertue of one who is even *Ecclesiastic* in the Church repure under the Kingdome of Satan, is very unwarrantable.

To make Christ a *Politick* head to one under Satans Kingdome, seemes very strange.

4. Ex-

4. Excommunication is the rendering of a man or a Nation to the Church.
Mat. 18. we do not differ here, but agree that Excommunication is meant
here what ever the *Erastians* say.

* Here let me
have leave to

put in a word. The *Erastians* expound this of civill injuries, or personall civill trespasses
only, and will prove it by comparing of Luke 17. 3. & with this; his Argument being,
because it is such a trespassse as a brother may forgive: Mr. *Gillespy* beflowes paines here, and
to good purpose; but let it be supposed the Texts run parallel, which Mr. *Gillespy* thinks not.
1. That Luke 17. saith, that a brother may forgive such a trespassse, as it were better a mil-
stone were hanged about his neck who offers it. But 2. we finde in 2 Cor. 12. 10. that *Paul*
forgave, and the Church of *Cornith forgave*, what, a trespassse done against them? No sure, the
incestuous persons act was no civil trespassse against *Paul* nor the Church, yet they *forgave*.
If then they can *forgive*, why may not a private brother also *forgive*? Thus it is supposed,
that the scandall which is here given, & for which the private brother dealeth with the offen-
dour privately, is but a private scandall, (for if it be publique, this way of dealing ceaseth)
if then this private brother dealing with the offendour finds the man to acknowledge his sin,
and repent, why may not he be said to *forgive* him also? [as in case it had been a publique sin
and cast out, upon his repentance the Church *forgive*] so that now he embraceth him in his
heart againe, proceedes not to call any other to deale with him, nor to tell it to the Church;
but the scandall is buried, forgiven, forgotten, *Erastians* say: I know no absurdity in this,
and so the forgiveness doth not prove it to be a civil trespassse only.

Had Christ said, let him be a Heathen (with reverence be it spoken) it
should seeme not to have beene so proper a speech, for he may not be a
Heathen, for he may hold his profession though cast out, and so is not pro-
perly a Heathen, but as a Heathen he is to the Church; now what that is
Mr. *Gillespy* tells us (and not he alone, but others) plainly: *he is to be used Aaro. rod 381.*
no better then an Heathen or prophane Publican, and is not to be admitted to any
Ordinance, except such as Heathen and prophane Publicans were admitted to. But
were they admitted to the Circumcision of their children? againe he opens Page 392.
it, let him be esteemed as one that hath no part in the Communion of Saints, in
Church membership (observe that, no Member then) in the holy things, in the
Covenant, of promise, more then a heathen man. How then such a one should
give title to the Seale of the Covenant I cannot tell.

For the text you bring in *Diarr. 2 Thes. 3. 14, 15.* If you please to view Page 218.
Mr. *Cornwright* on the text, you will finde he gives reasons why that text *Rhem. Test.*
most properly is meant of Suspension not Excommunication; so in his
Harmony upon Mat. 18. 17. he expounds this of Suspension: the text saith
you are to account him a Brother, but the excommunicated person (till repentance)
is no otherwise to be esteemed then as a Heathen; saith he, true, that which is
cause of Suspension is cause of Excommunication, if not repented of.
But I believe this text is the clearest you can have for Suspension.

That learned Mr. *Cornwright* is against the baptizing of the Infants of For. plea.
excommunicated parents, Mr. *Rush* hath acknowledged. Page 176.

If then I fall in this point, I shall fall with excellent men, Mr. *Cornwright*,
Hooker

Hooker, *Cetus* and others of our *N. E. Divines*, and others (it is likely) whom I know not.

General rules stand, when we have such a particular case (as you mention, p. 13.) falls out, we shall consider it, I give you no cases but such as have really bene.

Before I proceed further, I must have recourse to your *Distr.* with Mr. Hooker for another way of admitting children to Baptisme, viz. by *Adoption* or *Suretiship*: for this is one of my errors *that I suppose the next parent onely can give the title to Baptisme*; and this was Mr. Hooker's error as well as mine; you tell us two other ways: 1. *The remoter parents* [which I have dispatched, if it can be proved by better grounds then yet you have brought, yet it hurts not me nor Mr. Hooker, the questions stand firme still as we handle them:] The 2. is *Adoption* or *Suretiship*, so that you give three or rather four ways how children may come to Baptisme; for *Adoption* and *Suretiship*, I conceive differ very much. Yet these shall not hinder me neither, no more then Mr. Hooker, though you can prove them, if you will let them be persons rightly qualified for Church members, who do *Adopt*, &c. and by virtue of whom the child is baptised, so that I could ease my selfe that way; I like not this so well as the former. I will turn to *Gen. 17.*

Where we will observe who were to be circumcised, 1. *Abraham*, 2. his natural seed, 3. his servants then in his familie, whom he had taught the way of *Jehovah*, *Gen. 18. 19.* and who should seeme by faith to obey so hard a precept, their children also if they had any borne in the house. So afterwards those who were bought with money, which I conceive were only servants, these we finde in this *chap.* here then (under favour) I finde no Adoption, which I conceive is, *the taking of a stranger, or one who is not of our naturall seed, into the state of filiation.* But that *Abraham*, or the *Jewes* afterwards, tooke the children of Heathens into a state of filiation, I finde no such thing: I question much whether the *Jewes* could doe as we doe in Adopting make such our Heires; they could not I doubt give any of the Land of *Canaan* away to a Heathen, though they were Adopted, of which I finde no footsteps. To say they Adopted other *Jewes* children, and so circumcised them, this is vaine. Hence then I conceive if we cleave to the chapter, baptising by Adoption cannot be proved, because there was no circumcising by Adoption.

If it be objected; *If those who were bought, if servants might be circumcised, then those who are Adopted may be Baptised.*

I pray let us make no Syllogismes for first institutions; had Adoption there bene mentioned, and by vertue of that Circumcision administered, then the argument had bene fairer to prove baptizing by Adoption; but there appears no such thing in the first Institution.

If you will take liberty to make Institutions by syllogismes, we shall open a gap quickly.

2: This way of Adoption will seldome trouble us, for it is so rare a thing that I never as yet knew one that was thus Adopted, I have heard of one,

Ans. 17.
Gen. 27.

one, who also had his name changed, and inherited Lands, but I know him not: I know such as have no children, and they have been offered children, but they would never accept any.

3. Which is yet rarer, I never heard of any that did adopt children whilst they were Infants, but when grown up, so as they tooke liking of their manners and carriage; and sure if they came once to that, they should be instructed before baptised.

But how does this trouble me not if you can prove it, if all those who are children of such parents, as the question mentions, must come to be baptised by Adoption, some persons shall have children enough.

But for servants there the text is cleare, only whether it will hold under the Gospel? that is a question.

Give me leave humbly to propound my thoughts, I conceive that might be peculiar to that Church of the Jewes, who were the onely Church God had upon the earth, all the world besides them being shut out as so many Dogges, not allowed any meanes to enlighten them in the knowledge of God, but onely the Book of the Creature, Christ not allowing his Disciples so much as to go into their way to preach unto them, till the wall was broken downe; yet in that time the poore Gentiles had this priviledge, if they would become servants to the Jewes, they might be admitted to the Seal of the Covenant.

Pareus tells us of a Jew that called him Basilard Gentile as he was passing by him. Rom. 11. 29.

But when as the partition wall was broken downe, and Ministers sent out to preach to the whole world: now the Covenant was as free for the Gentiles as the Jewes, *teach and baptise*, you may go into Turkey, India, where you will, there is no wall to hinder you: so now that which was the ground of that administration being taken away, that to me seemes to cease. This also moves me to think so, because in the New Testament, after the wall was broken downe, we finde no mention of any such thing whelice we should ground this practise; for children of Believers we finde ground enough: if I did not see more for that in the New Testament then for servants, I should be very much shaken for Infant baptisme.

You ground is this: *It was so then for Circumcision*. Ergo, *now for Baptisme*. Your Consequence you prove, because priviledges are not strained under the Gospel.

I answer, 1. had God after Christ taken one Nation (suppose England, as then *Gaulen*) and tyed up his Church to such a nation, so that no other people could partake in the Ordinances but by joyning to England, then the argument had beene good, for still here had beene a wall which shut out the other nations, which was the ground of that Administration: but now the Church may be any where.

2. God hath recompenced that priviledge with a witness I think when he sends his Gospel to all the world, which before was tyed up to *little Galesen*.

3. If this still hold, then let the vilest monster in England [I have seen]

such Band for sinners in former times when their children were sold, than the Indians are honest men in comparison of them) being a servant which he hath bought, and become surety for (so ignorant the man is that hee had neede be catechised himselfe) let him being such a one to godly Mr. Gouge (if such a villaine lived in his parish) and bid Mr. G. baptise him; as he is his servant; would you doe it? you must doe it according to that text, for when they were Apostatiz'd they did, no question, circumcise them if they tooke them: let such a villaine be excommunicated; you give title also for ought I can discern by you, for though the heathens were excommunicated, yet I see by your doctrine they might circumcise such.

To say no, I would have such as are understanding and godly men only, (for not scandalous) who do undertake for them, able to instruct them, &c. Sir, you have nothing in the text for any such thing; besides if you can prove it, you butt not my question.

3. I observe a vast difference betweene their servants and ours, they had strong power over their servants, Exod. 21. 20, 21. I observed in New England, the Indians whom we had taken in warre, or others who lived with us sometimes halfe or a whole yeare, yet if they could handsomly get away from us they would, and did; we should have done finely to have baptised them; we buy no servants who are English men, or Christians, as you call them, to be under our power as they were. Hence learned Rives saith, there had neede be a great caution lest the Ordinance be perverted, for our servants are not as theirs. And learned Gouge speaks very warily upon the question: *Servus si fuerit servus quales olim, non differat iuram. Atrabano legimus imperatum ut circumcidere suos omnes servos, sed quales bodie nri servos habemus ut plurimum quales erit liberi sunt, non puerum pro tractandum, non cum quidem qui iure belli sunt subditi principibus, cum hoc genus subditorum nomen liberum manet: De haru ergo ex parvitate infidelibus liberis, si consensum parentes, distinguendum parent: Consensum enim vel ipsi facti fideles, ac tunc nulla differtio, &c. vel perseverantes in infidelitate, ac tunc non puerum baptizandum, &c.* For those who are *vere servi* which it comes we have none, but if we had such, should we baptise them being adults before they be taught the Covenant, and see if they will owne it? Teach and Baptise; for Infants, I thinke we never buy such servants.

4. For suretiship that comes not in this way by being bought as they were, I have nothing to say to it, if you can prove it to be a divine Institution I will attend to it, but I think it will prove but an humane Invention; for sureties being joynd with parents, we know who was the parent of that invention.

Ignatius was no Apostle: If you have a better parent for your suretiship I pray bring him forth.

If any man hath a minde to be a surety for other folkes children let him, for we here, I thinke those who have children of their owne, and know what is to educate them, will not be forward to be sureties for others: I doubt many men if they thinke how they have discharged their suretiship.

In Gen. 17.
p. 443. last Ed.
To. 4. l. 5. c. 31.
L. 2.

Genes. p. 17.
Pet. Mart. loc.
com. 822.

his answer, have answer to himself, for I think most ever regarded it; and how difficult it was when they were not under their charge, and remove so commonly so we do, I know not.

But you will say, that the Argument of Divines are for it; there is a little of this that is not acknowledged by *Calvin*, for he, *1. 4. p. 131.* he quotes *Calvin*, *De 1. 2. 3.* and for *Beza*, *Wales* doth acknowledge, *nam Judaeus et praevaricator. Athenius* also, *Roman*, *Quid* is against it.

Let me add one more of no small note, *Tertullian* in those words, *veniam dum adolescent, vivens dum dicitur*, which words you must either understand as some do against Infant-baptism altogether, as divers do, *saith de bapt.* *Lauren*, upon *Tertul.* and conclude from hence, and a place of *Nazian. Orat. in Sanc. Laus* that these two Fathers were against Infant-baptism [though I think *Nazian.* speaks enough in that *Oration* to clear his mind] or if you will not take it so, you must take it that *Tertullian* there speaks against baptizing by sureris, and he that reads two lines before shall easily perceive that is his meaning; and so *Mr. Marshall* interprets him, and that clearly: Against *Tomby* so then you have not all on your side. So much for your way of A- p. 36.

Now I returne to your answer 3 p. 15. you tell me there I have started a new question: Sir, you know I said at the first, I must move two questions, and for this had I not moved it, I had said nothing, for what if I had proved that it is only the new parent gives right to Baptism? yet if such parents as these in the Q. were judged fit Church members, and so fit to give title, I had said nothing, that therefore was my scope to prove these were not fit, and consequently ought to be reformed, or shut out of the Church; of which before.

You say not much to my first Argument to prove they are not, viz. because they are not visible Saints; you acknowledge they are not, nor ought to be admitted, if now they were to be admitted: then reforme such, or cast them out; for thus you say of *Comath*, I say it is no wonder though *Paul* call the whole Church Saints, making discrimination from the *millar*, and it is likely the *Major* part, as visible Saints: but had they beene all such as you say, grossly ignorant, or scandalous, whether the Apostle would then have called them Saints or no I cannot tell.

What you say about profession of faith that is requisite to give a man admission, I have said it before p. 1. you say presently: *This is sufficient for admission, but as there must be more, continue such in the Church*, &c. you say p. 19. more is required to first admission, then to continuance in the Church. I know not how to reconcile these.

For positive manner for Excommunication, you say right, there must be so indeed, and I think we are not to look for that: but for Excommunication I gave you my thoughts before.

For my second Argument that falls you say also: I doe not know that my first is fallen yet, for you have not denied the Argument. I pray what is the question? I must let it down because of these two answers

Td. 1. p. 492.
on Gen. 17.
p. 143.
de bapt.

Page 15.

Page 16.

Page 17.

They doe but say they believe in him, when whole conversation manifests the contrary.

you give to my two next Arguments, which you mightily confute.
The Q. is, *Whether a bare profession of Faith in Christ* [ten thousands in England doe barbarely say it, that they believe in him, they know nothing of Faith, nor of Christ, only the Name, such a one their Fathers or some body told them of, I gave you some instances before] *though persons be grossly ignorant, scandalous, and refuse to submit to Church Discipline, sufficient to make a man, and continue him a Member of the visible Church?* The first Argument stands as yet.

My second Argument was this,

"If this bare profession be sufficient, then none can be cast out for the vilest sins, Heresie, &c. because he is the same now as when he was admitted.

You answer, *The consequence is unsound, and the proofe like it* [you are very nimble methinks, but why so unsound?] *for when he was first admitted upon his profession, no such scandall appeared, but now is doeb, there he is not the same as he was, when admitted.*

To this I say, by *profession* you either meane such a *profession*, as you have mentioned above in this page, as I thinke you doe; and so you speake not *ad idem*, or if you meane such a *profession* as the questioner mentions, then Sir it is not so, for either grosse ignorance, or scandall did appeare, unless you meane that just at that time when he came to you and told you he did believe in Christ, he did not manifest any scandall to you; was not *drunke*, or did not *swear*, or shew *uncleanesse*, &c. just at that time: for so those who come to require Baptisme for their children, doe not come drunk, or swear, &c. in that very instant time, but before they came they would, and when the child is baptised, can swear, &c. and its well if divers be not drunk, if they have boone companions to joyne with; some have been little better. So that for all your haile the Argument is sound enough, but so is not your Answer.

The third Argument you say, *is like the former, very weak*: I pray leave out very, and let *weak* be enough, it is possible it will not prove *weak*. What is the Argument?

"A Rebbe! opposing Christ in his visible Kingdome is not fit to be a Member of it, because no subject.

You answer, *he is not fit to be admitted if no Member before*: Sir, what is the Q. *whether a such a bare profession, &c. is to make, &c. to make a Member?* then this is not fit your pen hath affirmed: but then the Argument is not very *weak*, but very *strong* to prove one part of the question, your selfe acknowledge it in your first words, and so you have done before, p. 16. [but say you he is fit to be continued till tryall of Reformation be past:] Sir you said above in this page, *that a bare profession with the mouth that he believes in Jesus Christ, though visibly he lives like an Infidel, is not sufficient to qualifye a man to be made or continued a Member.* The question speaks of such a bare profession, if you will say a moral conversation, though grossly ignorant, will save the turne, there hath beene as good, and now are among Infidels, and

and those who doe profess Christ, for drunkenness, swearing, &c. uncleanness, lying, railing, disobedience to parents, when growne up, &c. are as bad and worse then Infidels, *Infidels* will shame them, so that the *sufficiency* of his profession is not that which doth continue him a Church-member, but the Churches continuance, or impotency if the Church were about to reforme and could not, as in the time of the Hierarchie: if it be the *sufficiency* of his profession keeps him in, for ought I know you may let him alone when power is in your hand to cast him out.

Most of this page is spoken to before, only to two propositions (as you call them) of mine. Page 18.

You answer:

"That which constitutes a Church, continues a Church: if then a bare profession be not sufficient to make a Member, nor is it enough to continue a man a Member of a Church.

You answer, both Propositions are faulty: the Minor, for we have proved that a profession of faith, nothing appearing to the contrary, will constitute a Member, and so a Church of many Members though all Hypocrites.

But Sir, the profession of faith you speake of here, is not the profession of faith the question speaks of, for the question speaks of such a profession as hath grosse ignorance, or open scandall appearing, therefore you speak not *ad idem*.

For all Hypocrites: there is (as M. Cartwright faith) difference between Tares and Acorns, Goats and Swine.

The Major is faulty, say you, because more is required to a first Admission, then to a Continuance in the Church, as is evident in men of years converted from Infidels; a personall profession of faith is necessary to such, but their children are admitted and continued without it. Page 19.

Sir, you should have proved that more is required to the Admission then the Continuance of the same person: speake *ad idem*, there should seeme rather that more is required to Continuance then Admission, for being longer under means he should have attained more in that time, then he had when first admitted. You say children are admitted and continued without personall profession: I grant it, but admitted it seems they are, and surely that is, because they are reputed in the parents for visible Saints, fit matter for a Church; yet them continue such as they were reputed to be at their admission and it is well enough, no more shall be required. Or if there be any difference it is this, more is required to their continuance: for they to their admission, were required to be but visible Saints by vertue of their parents, reputed such for their sakes, but for their continuance they must when growne up manifest actually they are such, or else be cast out: so more is required for Continuance then Admission, and so your proposition is false.

1 Cor. 7. but now, Holy.

For your last clause in that Paragraph, [there is another way to reforme a continued Church but corrupted, then first to constitute a Church, viz. Discipline]

I know not what fault to make of it. I supposed there was fault even in the Printer, but I finde no wrong printed, and so neither will I write to say you: I said let Discipline be extended, and so the Churches and besides their first constitution, are to be such as Churches ought to be. I perceive your next words are to oppose this, you say *Government settled*; you may have it if you will, as I said before, *perius seque* to submit to it, say you, than I am the stronger; for if there be no Excommunication, I am not tied to baptise till they be excommunicated, which you urge so much.

You aske me againe, would I have such suddenly ejected? why Sir as there no Church-Discipline but Excommunication? we use unlesse offences be very notorious (and we have enough such) first to admonish persons seriously to bring persons to repentance; if that will not doe, we suspend; if that will not doe, then excommunicate. I said before, the times we now are cast in are to be considered, as the *Magden Professours* speake in the same case, but because you cannot excommunicate you will doe nothing: and when you have excommunicated it is all one with you, so that you doe but delude us. I doe not absolutely deny any Baptisme, but conditionally if they will not come to be instructed, and give us some better testimony of their conversation: but before they will be certified by me, and give any better testimony they will sing away.

Now say you will be argued: will be easily dissolved, its well. What you have spoken to in this page 20. I have answered before; onely where-as you say, I have often confessed that persons *excommunicated ought not to be excluded the Lords Supper*. Sir, I will keepe to the title of my Booke, it shall be *A Soder Reply*, and I say, I have not once said any such thing.

But then you call to Ministers to examine whether they have done well in excluding bawle (it may bee) of their Parish from the Supper by their owne power alone. And page 26. 28. you seeme to condemn this practise; O brave Reformation! in the Bishops time a Minister alone made no question to doe this; and now every Minister is a Bishop, as I am sure you will grant, that a Bishop and Presbyter is all one; yet now Ministers must not doe it, but let all come to the Supper, till a Glass be set up.

Here you tell us we cry out againe, and call people to separate from you because you want an Ordinance, then adde, *The Lord Judge betweene us in this matter*: this sentence you use also in your other booke, but I pray apply it to those who so call for separation from you, my conscience clears me from any such thing: therefore Sir doe you not use such a sentence vainely.

Then you come to answer the weak Argument: Such as the question mentions, *as just ought*, and *as just are excluded* from the Lords Supper, Ergo, ought also to be excluded from their Infants Baptisme.

But you say you deny with all the proofes of it, the Proofe is as weak as the Consequence

So some conceive non-Communion to be an Act of Church-Discipline.

Page 20.

Page 21.

"*disfranchisement, viz. " Because Baptism (unlike in the same Communion, as the Lords Supper doth. Ergo, if excluded from one Scale, then from the other.*

"*The proof against is like to the former, viz. " Because such persons appear not to be those to whom the Seal of the Lords Supper doth belong, having no right in those privileges; therefore Baptism signifying and sealing so great privileges as the Lords Supper, they cannot convey a title unto that Scale for their children, but ought to be excluded.*

All is weak that Mr. Coadrey opposes; there are in Logick those ways of answering, which Logicians call *Soluzioni apparence*; one of them is, *Adversus*; this you are well acquainted with, so slight the Arguments brought against you, tell your Reader they are weak; and that halfe an answer at least.

All are not of your minde concerning this Argument: Mr. Humphreys faith, *those who have gone about to answer this, had better happily said nothing, for our cause of baptism, and a deniall of this is such a Seem-vant as will never be unanimously drawn up, though Aloud together.* For his judgment in Admission of all to Lords Supper I leave it.

His Viadication of free Admiss. to L. Sup. p. 24.

But let us see how weak you shew it: your answer is this,

This Argument ought to proceed of the same persons, viz. such as ought to be excluded from the Lords Supper, ought (if now they were to be baptised) also to be excluded from Baptism for themselves: but this doth not reach the children, for they being borne Christians, of Christians have rights to Baptism.

What Sir, have you catched me in that fallacy, I have taken you so often in? I hope not: I have spoken before to this, the title of the parents and the children is but one and the same.

1. I doubt not but Master Coadrey conceives there are thousands in England that deserve ought to be excluded the Lords Supper, else he must condemn the Assembly for injudicious men that should trouble the Parliament for an Act, &c.

2. These Mr. Coadrey yields; were they now to be baptised ought not to be baptised, the argument proceeds cleare against them.

3. Yet the children of such parents being borne Christians, of such Christians as ought not to be baptised themselves (if they were not baptised) these may: which is strange to me, that children which have their title because borne of such parents they may be baptised, but the parents themselves who give the title, must not:

Therefore I reply, if the argument proceeds so strongly against the parents themselves, then much more against the children, for I my self who must have title first for my selfe, and then for my child, ought to be denyed it, then much more my child, whose title is mine, and depends wholly upon me for it: for this I conceive to be a sound truth, if a person have ten or twenty children, and these be baptised because Christians, borne of such a parent, then I doe twenty times justify that the parent from whom these

these children proceed, have right and title to Baptisme. So that which you say is not a sound assertion, p. 24. (which how it came under the third argument I know not, for it belongs to the first,) viz. " If I can give the child one Scale of the Covenant by vertue of the parent, I will give the parent the other, I think is a very sound assertion, it never troubled me as yet. But what makes it so? say you, *I may see reason to deny the parent the Lords Supper, and yet baptise his child, because more is required of the one then the other.*

For the child I require nothing of it, but looke to the parent from whom it derives its title, if you require any thing of me, saith the child, goe to my parent from whom I descended: why then doe you say, *you require more of the one, then the other?* neither a. doe I see what more you are to require of a person to admit him to the Lords Supper, then his child to baptisme: If a person doe visibly appeare to have the condition of the Covenant, he being a Church-member, how you can deny him the Lords Supper I know not: so for baptisme. If there were two conditions of the Covenant of grace, and that Baptisme respected one, and the Lords Supper the other, then there might be some reason, why the Church should looke to one more then another, but I know but of one condition.

Page 21.

You say moreover: *The young children of members are next to be admitted to the Lords Supper, yet not to be excluded from Baptisme, The reason is because more is required to the Lords Supper, then to their Baptisme.*

To which I say: 1. If children did as much depend on their parents for the Lords Supper, as they doe for Baptisme, then for ought I know, they may have (as was the old custome) the Lords Supper, as Baptisme.

2. You should have proved that lesse is to be required of those who doe give them title to their Baptisme, then for themselves to the Lords Supper.

Page 22.

So that whereas you say, *all my false consequences are grounded upon my first (false) premised supposition, viz. [That the child hath no right but in relation to the next parent]* (the word next (by your favour) was not there put in,) so I say your answer to this argument, runs upon a false supposition, viz. *that children are baptized by vertue of a title distinct from their parents.* If you can prove that, viz. that the parent requires baptisme for himselfe by one title, and the child by another title distinct from his, then your answer will be strong, else it is as weake and weaker then the argument, which you so much slights: for the rest of your answer, I have spoken to it before, and therefore repeat nothing for the examples of *Scripture or History*: will you doe nothing but what you have example for? is not argument drawne from *Scripture*-grounds sufficient for me, though there be not examples set downe? For the *personall defaults* I have spoken to it before.

I may consider the Parent and Child, as, *argumentum primum* for or sum in Logick: *argumentum primum habet arguendi vim in se, et 2 se: orium in se sed non 2 se.* Its but derived.

For my *Dilemma* which you would turne upon me, I see you take that for granted which I have not yeilded, therefore my *Dilemma* stands as it did before against you.

Page 23.

For my *Querie* (*Whether the child may not be suspended in case the parent be suspended*)

(*suspended continuing obstinate*) you would answer one out of principles which are not mine; I pray prove, *this suspension is an Ordinance instituted only with respect to the Lords Supper.* Secondly, prove that the case now standing with us as now it doth, in beginning of Reformation, wee may not deny the *signa gratiae* as the *Layden professors* say, though by reason of the multitude we cannot proceed to Excommunication. 3. Why may we not proceed to non-communion?

My second Argument was this.

"Such Parents if now they were to be Baptized, ought not to be

"Baptized, Ergo, they cannot challenge it for their Children:

"Baptisme belongs primarily to the Parent.

You againe deny the consequence and the prooofe of it.

First you say: *It is a received maxime amongst the Lawyers, quod fieri non debuit, factum valet: Suppose an infis person Baptized, his Baptisme is not null, he is a Member still legally excluded, and so hath right for himselfe and his to be consequent Priviledges.*

Hence first those Indians whom the Fryars Baptized in the West Indies *Hoylen Geog.* without instruction, have right and title for themselves and theirs to all Church-priviledges. The persons were unfit who were Baptized *I am sure* *unfit*, yet saith Mr. Ca. unfitness doth not debarre, till excluded. No nor then neither. Let others doe as those Fryars did, yet this Argument holds.

Secondly, this answer carrieth it, *That Baptisme makes a Member of a visible Church*: observe his words, *suppose an infis person Baptized, his Baptisme is not null, he is a Member*: which way came this man to be a Member? not by his Christianity, (which you use to say) for he is a person *unfit* you say: but his Baptisme made him thus, which is

2.
If unfit to be Baptized, then unfit to be a Member.

First, crosse to your own proposition: *Reverie of Mr. Ho, P. 94. Baptisme doth not make a man a Member of a Church.*

Secondly, if Baptisme doth make a Member, and consequently gives the title to his Childs Baptisme, Then *Constantine, Valentinianus, &c.* those who deferred their Baptisme, were so long no Members of the Church, nor could give title to their Childrens Baptisme.

Thirdly, *Primum in unoquoque genere est mensura aliorum*: so take the first in *genere Baptizatorum*, what was the cause of their Baptizing; because they hearing of the word Taught, Believed, and joynd to the Church; it was not because any other was Baptized, so the same holds now, a person being reputed a Believer and a Church-member [whether in the Parents or otherwise] this is the ground of its Baptisme; then it is not anothers being Baptized that is the ground of my Baptisme.

Fourthly, the ground of the sealing of the Covenant, is because the person appears to be in Covenant, not because it was first sealed to another. The Child is looked upon within the Covenant by reason of the Parent, as was *Ismael* before *Abram* was circumcised, if in the Cove-

4.

nant, then (say you) the child is a Church-member: then it is not the Parents being Baptized that gives the title. Hence your Notion in the same Page 23. [*If the Parents sin did annul his own Baptisme, it were a question whether it did not binder his childes Baptisme*] which also implies it is the Parents Baptisme that is the cause of his childes Baptisme. J comes to nothing.

Your second answer, is from none of my Principles.

Your third I have spoken to also. *I did not expresse excommunication as a qualification in the question: it is true, I have spoken to this also before.*

What you have said to the third Argument, I have also spoken to before, my fourth Argument ran thus: [*To give the seal of the Covenant of grace to a child by vertue of one who appears to be in covenant with the Devill, is a prophaning of the Ordinance.*]

To this you answer foure wayes, the last I have spoken to, but not the other three, which I will consider.

Page 25,

First, *you deny that such persons as the Q. mentions are visibly in Covenant with Satan, especially if tolerated, for so long they are visibly in the externall covenant of the Church.*

What you meane by this *Externall Covenant* of the Church I cannot imagine: not Baptisme I hope; nor the *Externall Church covenant* wee speake of, and you so much oppose; for the Covenant of grace, they are not visibly under that: there needs no Covenant *formally* betweene the Devill and us, naturally hee hath us strong enough though wee make no *formall* Covenants with him. But when are men said to be under the Covenant of Grace? is it not when they, 1. Seeke to understand it, 2. Choose it as their greatest joy and portion, 3. Rejoyce in nothing so as when under the power of it, 4. When will not endure to be drawne from under the Dominion of it, but their hearts sinke with sorrow when the old man rebels against it, 5. When externally their Conversation answers it, 6. When delight in those who are in Covenant with themselves also, &c. Turne it now, when persons care not for understanding of that Covenant, but they are wise in wayes of sinne, choose those wayes, their joy is when they are in the enjoyment of such wayes, cannot endure to be pulled off from them, but troubled when stopped in their course, visibly thus they walke in their course, and choose such for their companions, what shall wee judge of these? What ever *Covenant* you meane, I am sure they are not under that Covenant visibly, of which Baptisme is a *Seale*.

Secondly, *you say, suppose a Person be Excommunicate, and so delivered unto Satan (as the incestuous Person was) yet it were hard to say he were visibly in Covenant with Satan, though at the present under his Power.*

To be under a Church-censure, which is appointed for cure of a Person, is far different from the case now we speak of.

What

That power of Satan the excommunicate person is under, is an afflictive power, therefore not chosen by the person, as is the other.

Those who are not Excommunicated may be visibly in Covenant with Satan in that sense the Argument speaks of, when one who is Excommunicated may not be so, as the incestuous person repenting, and sunk with sorrow.

Thirdly, you say, every gross sin (as in Noah and David, &c.) does not conclude a man visibly in Covenant (with Satan you means) much less ignorance, as in children and you be Baptized.

To this I say 1. If I had not revered your grace and Parts, I would have given you another answer, for it is strange that when I in the proofe of the Minor said, [*A person whose course and Trade of Life is to live in sin*] that yet you should answer from Noah and David, their particular acts, repented of, &c. You would make me a silly fellow that could not distinguish betweene the course of a mans life (when I expressed it) and a particular act.

2. In Baptizing of Infants, I doe not consider them as ignorant persons, but visible Saints with their Parents, and those must have knowledge.

3. How are we gone from the ignorance of the Parents, to the ignorance of the Infant?

Then you come in with your Epithema, [*see whether this new way leads its followers.*] Yes, I pray see by what you have answered, whither it leads: I think you might have spared your triumphing here, unless your answer had beene stronger.

For my fifth Argument, the jumbling of the most prophane and godly in the same Ordinance and under the same Prayers; you tell me I may doe it, so I do but grieve, &c. of this before: but for when conscience flies in a mans face for giving away the Seale of the Covenant to such a one, this will not quiet conscience to tell it; Mr. Gundry saith you may do it. You know what Dr. Ames said before.

Then you come to the great Objection. The Jewes circumcising of all. My first answer to this Objection was,

"I would see a proofe that the Priests did debarte many from the
"Passover, for morall, and cleane use, many yeares, (as ours
"doe from the Supper) and yet had their children circum-
"cised.

To this you answer: *The Priests are blamed for admittins the Morally unclean to some Ordinances, but in concerne him to prove where ever they were blamed for circumcising the Children of Israh.* 44. Ezek. 9.

To which I say, 1. That Text speaks of the times under the Gospell, and it cannot be accomplished under the Old Testament, as our Annotations make it cleare, it speaks of a time when circumcision is out of date.

2. Circumcision was never committed to the Priests as now Bap-
tisme

refine to the Ministers, therefore there was no blame to them due for that point.

3. Since it respects the Gospell, it concerns those who practise so as if by *Sanctuary* were meant onely the *Lords Supper*, to prove that there, where the Priests are blamed for bringing into the Sanctuary such persons, he means onely admission to the Lords Supper, those who interpret must prove. It should seeme very faire, that *Sanctuary* is more then Lords Supper, I suppose those who were brought into the Sanctuary might come to the Paschever in old time.

Your second answer is, you *Question the Practice of our Ministers, whether it can be justified*. I see you are pinched, but no doubt their keeping of that holy Ordinance is justifiable enough.

My second answer was, [I conceived some thing was peculiar to that Church in that Ordinance, and so conceive still. I shall add something more.]

1. In that there was no Minister separated by God to the dispensing of it, as is now of Baptisme: but *Parents, Masters, Judges, Men or Women*, yea themselves might administer it.

2. It did not runne to his seed onely as *Spiritual*, [as doth Baptisme now, for onely Believers are Abrahams Seed] but to his Seed as sub. The ground indeed of Gods giving of the Seale of the Covenant at first was, because of that Covenant God was in with Abraham, but this Covenant they (many of them) did never regard but reject, taking Circumcision onely to be the Covenant, so being his Seed in whom they did so glory, they would circumcise their Children, though the Devill was their Father.

3. From the nature of the Seale and Signe being an abiding Marke in the flesh (which Baptisme is not.) And by that they were distinguished from the Heathens by an apparent marke, it made me thinke there was something God further aimed at in it, in reference to them: which

I perceive *Justin Martyr* will second me in: when *Trypho* had beene urging the necessity of Circumcision, hee answers him; God foreseeing you should be scattered, and beaten out of Jerusalem, and not returne thither againe, lest Circumcision a Marke in your flesh, now by no other note can you be knowne but by your Circumcision. This is part of his answer. And surely there seemes to be something in it, for had it

not beene for Circumcision, in these many yeares they have beene scattered; they might easily have lost their Distinction from the Gentiles, at least abundance of them, but by this they are knowne to this day.

4. This much prevails with me to thinke something was peculiar, because 17. Gen. 14. Those who were not Circumcised were to be cut off. Whether by the Magistrate, or by Excommunication, as faith learned

Glaphy

Mat. 3. 9.
Job. 8. 39. 44.

*Dialog. cum Trypho. ou. Samaritanos
den γαρ ἀλλοχόθεν ἐστὶ γινωσκόμενοι
ὡς περὶ τῶν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ τὴν σάρκα
ἀποτομῆς.*

Childs, take it how you will, will you say the same of Infants not baptised? must the Magistrate cut such off? or shall the Church excommunicate all such? I trow Mr. Marshall will take up the Cudgels against you, for he is In his Sermon so farre from thinking that Churches should excommunicate *Anabaptists*, if before the L. godly, that he chargeth that Church with *Schisme*, which shall deny them Major on Communion because *sub*. Expound it how you will, (so it be true) that *Easter Monday* will shew some difference, and argue something was peculiar. 2652.p.18.

5. I said [when the Jewes came to require Baptisme, it was not enough 2. Ed. we are *Abrahams* seed, Ergo, baptise us, [this was enough to Circumcision] but *John* requires Repentance.

To this you answer, it was a new Ordinance, in which Repentance was required in the first parents.

1. But what then? though new, it was but a Seale to the same Covenant they were in before, and they being visibly under the same Covenant, why should more be required of them, if there were not some difference between the administrations of these Ordinances?

2. But was not Repentance required in Circumcision? did not Circumcision note the cutting off the Old Man? and is that done without Repentance? if repentance were not required there as well as in Baptisme, you will confirme me the more, and weaken the arguing from Circumcision to Baptisme, very much in my apprehension. 2 Col. 111

6. This made me to think so, because when they fell to their soule Apostasy, yet they Circumcised: I pray Sir speake out plainly, if one of your Members should sacrifice his children to *Molech*, worshipp those vile and unclean Gods, which they did, would you baptise his child without any more ado?

If none but such as *Maymony* (before quoted) saith, ought to be circumcised, then their Circumcision was irregular, for they threw off *Abrahams* way, and his God: but if all *Abrahams* seed, as *sub*, meerey according to the flesh, had a title to Circumcision, then it was peculiar to them, and they were regularly enough circumcised. But this helps not us.

7. That place *Ezra* 10. 3. the children borne of the strange wives were to be put away, as well as the strange wives; its very likely they would circumcise them, but yet put away: if they ought not to be circumcised or were not, yet it will imply some difference.

For all the rest to p. 29. I have spoken to before: there after you had condemned my rigidnesse for non-admission of the children of some parents, then you shew your Judgement, that all ought to be Baptized.

1. You say if one Minister will not baptize, another will, [let others doe as they please, I must give account of my Stewardship not his] it will increase divisions betwixt Ministers, by others intermeddling with their charges. [I was never yet offended with any man who did Baptise the children of such as dwell in outparish: I thought intermeddling with other folkes charges had been no offence to the Classicall Government, which will excommunicate a person in another mans charge.]

לְהַצִּיחַ

His propositum:
vulg. ejicimus:
Vana.

It will make the next generation, no better than Infidels being unbaptised.

This may prevent abundance of sinne and ignorance, making parents looke about them, working (as experience hath proved in *N. England*, to reall conversion (as in charity we may judge) at least to knowledge and outward conformity in divers here also in *England*, in your owne shire: the prooffe is made, a godly minister that lives there told me, he will not baptise without a good account given him, and to this day (he told me at the Commencement) two in his parish were unbaptised; the people observing this, he told me they besittre themselves to get knowledge, and give better account.

It is is the fruit already tried, but what then if all Ministers did so?

Because unbaptised, Ergo Infidels, Constantine, Valentinianus and others, were unbaptised a long time, therefore they were Infidels, and *Valentinianus* dyed an Infidel, because he dyed unbaptised.

This will exasperate parents you say.

Wee must looke for rubs at first, our life is not such as to have the good word and will of every body; but this daintinesse must come downe.

1. Whilst we have the civill power to stand by, it may be done the more easily.

2. If one of the parents give any comfortable account, it is sufficient.

3. Women, their sexe commands them more modesty, and their education helps, if there be knowledge, they have advantage also of affections, and so easier moved upon by preaching the Word.

4. For number, we shall find the most opposition will be in the poorer sort, where horrible ignorance besides prophanenesse abounds.

5. It is but visible Sainthood that is required; you have said enough, in my opinion, as for maintenance (which you mention) thousands of Ministers in *England* have the advantage of me, *N. England* voyage having broken and spoyled our Estates, but ordinarily Ministers have Lands of their owne, and some good Glebe-Lands, wherein they are before me.

I observe but two things,

1. For what you say, *you would have the Magistrate settle a right Government which all Congregations should be bound to submit to.*

Sir, you speake of a hard thing, the Magistrate must needes be troubled to know which is that right Government, when there is so much difference among the Ministers who call for it; one sayes it is *Classicall* Government, another it is *Congregational*, and both sides very godly men: *The Ark must needs shake when the Oxen stumble.*

2. Yet such is the neerenesse of the agreement between the *Congregational*, and *Classicall* Government, that though one be not bound to submit to the other, yet Church-government might goe on well enough, (were it

not

not for this *Separation*, which will undermine both: if there were brotherly yeilding on both sides but a little; if the peace of the Churches were as much valued as it hath been by other holy men before times, wee would not, we dare not doe as we doe.

The Magistrate doth give leave for these two, which in respect of Government are so neere, that they need not be called two: but this fearfull blasting of the Ordinances by the sore hand of God, and this horrible disunion betweene the Congregationall and Classicall men, and others who are godly, say in my heart, there hangs a scourge over both Congregationall and Classicall men, and other professors.

For the rest, p. 30. there is little to answer:

2. For your bringing in the *Autority of the civill Magistrate, to reforme our people as Church-members*; this will be poore Reformation: I thought Church-members had been *formed* and *reformed*, by the sword of the Spirit, not of the Magistrate, they can scarce make better Lawes then they have made, for reforming of Morall vices, I think the fault lyes not in them, they cannot be Judges and Witnesse too.

For your last, p. 31. *that you would have us presse the conditions of the Covenant on those that we baptise, and that is sufficient now.*

If I were onely a *Teacher* this might suffice, but I thinke I am (or should be) a *Ruler*, as well as a *Teacher*.

If this be enough, then admit all *England* to the Lords Supper without scruple.

Thus Sir I have replied to your Booke, with as much brevity as I could; I know such a man as you are will not be quiet thus, but will write againe; (I foresee some things (and possibly you may make use of my Booke against the Separation against me) which I could have prevented, but upon some reasons moving me I let them alone:) and it will be hard (though I am but weak) if I should not spy out some things in your writing which I might oppose againe, but I see there will be no end of writing, wherefore I am resolved to make an end; onely if I finde you bring our more strength then yet I have seen, and that which giveth me satisfaction, I will returne you very hearty thanks, and publish it to the world that you have satisfied mee: if not, I will be silent.

A POST-SCRIPT

To Reverend Mr. Blake.

MY reply to Mr. *Cawdrey* was ready for the press within seven weeks after his answer came out, but by the ill dealing of that Bookseller who had my Copy first in his hand, it comes to be thus long before it came forth: I heard not of Mr. *Blake* a long time after he came forth, and have possessed his book no longer then to have but one whole day to review him, and draw up my reply, which I would have done *κατά πρόςας*, but that my Bookseller is unwilling to venture the charges for the printing in these days. I have not read over any more (as yet) then what concerns my selfe, and for his courteous handling of me without scorne, I kindly thanke him. I have liberty to mention but two or three things, which I shall doe with as much brevity as I can.

Page 431.

1. He observes, *I am diffident rather then confident of my opinion.* Sir, I did write as a man who was troubled about it, my Arguments at present casting the scale on the negative side, though I had not such downe weight as I desired: but truly Sir I see nothing as yet to make me recall my opinion, for all that is said (excepting Mr. *Cawdrey's* notion of *Adoption* in which your selfe are not cleare) I knew before.

2. I observe sometimes you dresse my Argument with such a fashion that I cannot know it to be mine, but disclaime it, then you finde fault: p. 439. where have I mentioned the power of *godliness* as a requisite in him who claims Baptism? but to bring up a child in it is a harder matter: I have not liberty to enlarge.

3. Sometimes your answer is a bare laying downe your owne Judgement, with a Similitude added for illustration. P. 441. We now call for Scripture and reason from thence; *Similia ad pompam non ad pugnam.*

4. For my first Argument for the negative, p. 449. 450. which you say was Mr. *Blackwoods*. I never saw any thing of his, but I tooke it from our Brethrens practise, and it was that (with one thing more) which led mee into my practise: for when I saw the *Presbyteriall* Brethren keep back half or three quarters of their Churches from the Lords Supper, and that for divers yeeres together, yet did so constantly baptise their children, I thought with my selfe, where have these men a ground for this practise? in all the New Testament I could not finde one, nor reason for it, but rather against it:

it for the Old Testament, though I knew some were kept back for Ceremonial uncleanness from the passover, yet for Moral uncleanness to be kept back many years, and still to have their children circumcised, I found no text for that.

For Mr. *Gifford*, I have not liberty to set downe my thoughts.

You frame your answer by turning my argument another way; then requiring me to give answer to your Syllogisme: which Sir, is no clever way of disputation; And for answer I need give you none, Mr. *Tobson* before you, and you in his words (though it may be you saw him not) have given a full answer; yet my Argument is not hurt at all, though the parent may be suspended for a time, what is this to the suspension of three parts of a Church, six or ten years together, and never proceed further? I would have enlarged if I might.

I observed many other things, to which I would have replied, but I shall single out only one thing which I will examine.

Page 4. 26. *Infants of Parents that are nomine tenus, Christiani hinc rights in Baptisme. If they profess the worship of the true God; though nothing more of a Christian be in them.* Page 4. 24.

If by a Christian *nomine tenus* your meaning were, *one whole but a nominall Christian, as all are who are not real*. I make no question but many such as these nominall ones a Minister may Baptize, and their children, though they have not truth of grace in them: but I perceive your scope is to spread the word very large; and that directly opposite to my question; If they will say they are *Christians*, beare the Name of Christ, own his worship (though it be but from the custome of the Nation, others do so, and so do they) though their course and frame of conversation be like the infidels, or worse. yet they are *Christians nomine tenus*, hence we must Baptize, if they have but *Fides*, no matter for *Observantia*.

But Sir, I pray what if they be hereticall about the natures of Christ as some of old deny the Humanity, some the Deity of Christ? what if they thinke Christ was a Woman (as I have given instance) what if they know not whether he was God or Man (as before) what if ten Gods (as before) and abundance of such stuffe (all which yet will call themselves *Christians*) must these be Baptized? These are errors in their beliefs.

But let us suppose they understand God and Christ, for their Faith they are right; but abominable in their conversation, are we now bound to Baptize because of their Faith?

1. Sir I thought Christianity had taken in the heart, and outward conversation as well as the head, a real Christian is one united to Christ, found in the Doctrine concerning Christ, and walking as Christ did [we suppose an old Adam]. Let him who is a nominall Christian appear like one, though he be not real, Mr. *Ca* will not allow him sit, if visibly he lives like an infidel, though he professes his faith in Christ.

2. Let us view the Scripture in the administration of Baptisme.

The 1 Mark 4. Baptisme of Repentance; this is more then Faith: they confessed their sins. v. 5. the 3. as had not idolls now to confesse that sin. Doth not the ordinance note repentance also?

Against the Anabap. Argu. 5.

* Ame Mid. Thel c. 37. th.

22. Guler. in. 38. Ep. C. 77.

1011
1010 d

Aug. de fide op. 2 AE. op. c. 8.

Mag. Feb. 1691.
1.1. cap. 10.

Mag. Feb. 1691.
1.1. cap. 10.

Mag. Feb. 1691.
1.1. cap. 10.

(54)

Mag. Feb. 1691.
1.1. cap. 10.

Secondly, having a *small* works by the power of the Word.
Thirdly, Reserving the Word.

Fourthly, Repenting, they are Baptized, this is more still.

8. *Act.* Though there is not mention made of the *Sanctification* repentance, who were *Apollinized* from the Jews but said claims to the *Par* marks, *Jo. 4. 10.* expected Christ, *v. 25.* worshipped God, *Act. 4. 3.* Yet that *Philip* should know them to be so abominable in conversation, and yet Baptize them, that is to be proved, since that others required repentance, I believe there was a more then ordinary presence at that time, to enlighten, so to *aw* their hearts, the same answer we may give for these, that *Augustin* doth for the *Eumuch*, *Bapt. c. xvi. cum Philippo, intelligi voluit impleta omnia, qua licet sacerdos in Scripturis gratia breviter, nonnullis serie traditionis sanctis implenda. Irenaeus and Tertullian* have said enough for the *Eumuch*, besides *Augustin*, and the Text is plaine.

Ubi prim. c. 9.

If this be not a giving *Holy things* to Dogs (which *Tertullian* and *Augustin* give warning of even in Baptizing) I know not what is: Let a man be a notorious Ranter, Sodomite, Scoffer at Godliness, Drunkard, no matter what, this is known and proved, yet a Christian require *repent*, Therefore you must Baptize him.

a De parit.
b Ora. 40.

That *Repentance* as well as *Faith* was looked to in Baptizing, it appears by the ages following the Apostles, for those who would live in their lusts, they deterred their Baptisme, knowing what was required. So *Tertullian*, and *Nezelan* intimate, who exhort them to confession of their sinne from the example of *John*. *Just. Mart. Apol. 1.* is cleare for more then you mention.

For the *Catechumens* they were strict we see, *Cyvil. Neocæs. Can. 5. Council. Nic. Can. 13. Council. Eph. Can. 42.* a good conversation they required, though for their long deferring I approve not that.

Believer and *Saint* you say are *Synonima's*. Dr. *Ames* gives the reason, which will not help you fir. *Medul. Theo. c. 32. 8.*

For the ill Members in *Corinth* and *Sardin*. 1. Sir you must prove the Apostles knew them to be such when they admitted them, and Baptized them, that they wallowed in their filth. 2. That the Churches were not too blame in leaving them alone, 3. To have a *Name to live*, is more then you speak of.

For *ignorance*, you quote the *Hebrews* which I thinke hurts not me, that of *1 Cor. 15. 34.* Is the most likely, but fir do you thinke it was such grosse ignorance as I have given instance? was not *Paul* as true to his worke as *Abraham* or the Jews were to be in admitting to circumcision, which you mention Page 445. I have found so much ignorance that the persons deserved shame, but yet dared not keepe from the Lords Supper, because I found such a worke on the heart, which showed they had the thing, though could not expresse the thing in a definition.

For

For the *Presbyteries* they have delivered their mind otherwise: the *Pastors, Councils, and Synods* are of another Opinion, as appears by *Grug. de val*, but I quote no more then I have read, I hope then you will pardon methough I differ. For your Answers to my Arguments.

Your distinction of the word *Saint* I accept, and doubt not but your eyes are so good, that you can see a difference betweene a man who is but *nomine* *semm* a Christian and wallowes in his filth, and another, who walkes outwardly like a Saint, though hee have not the reall qualifications of a Saint.

The second Argument must cost you two lines more before it be answered.

If a man be but *Nomine* *semm* a Christian, though never so abominable in his conversation, yet must be admitted a Member, then hee cannot be cast out of the Church for any vile sin, so long as he is *nomine* *semm* a Christian, he is now as he was when you admitted him.

You say the consequence is erroneous, because he did not make profession of his sin, but of his Faith, As *Simon Magus*.

Then it seemes the man must profess his sin with his own mouth, as his Faith, though Mr. Blake knows he is a Ranter, &c. The Members of the Church witness it, yet because the mans own mouth doth not profess it, you admit him. Then sir, though you know the same abominations afterward, and your Members witness it, witnesses come in, you must not cast him out unless he will profess it. If Knowledge and Witnesses will cast him out (whether his mouth will profess it or no) why will not the same keepe him out at first? We shall never find such I thinke as you speake of, they will give you good words when they come to require Baptisme, though they will sweare and be drunk before and after in the same day.

For *Simon Magus*, I have spoken to him before, and Mr. Gillespie answers Aar.rod. 482. for me.

What is that *Conscience* you would have passed upon a manifest opposer of Christ in his visible Kingdome? he was no subject I said, Therefore not fit for a Church-member.

But sir I have not liberty to go further: onely this I must adde, I follow this dispute with much sadness in respect of mine own heart: for your else and Mr. Ca. I honour you both, your graces, your abilities I acknowledge are before mine, but in this point I must see more light before I yeild: as for the bond of Unity I hope (by my piece against the Separation) you will conceive me to be one who will hold it firme with you, in this Point, I leave you to your own light, and shall conclude with the words of *Cyprian* [though some may say I am in an error as he was] *Manente concordia vinculo, & perseverante Catholica Ecclesia individuo Sacramento, actum suum disponis & dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rursus nem propositi sui Domino redditurum.* Ep. 52.

FINIS.



To the Reader.

I Had but three houres liberty, and that in the night, to run over my book, and correct it, I did not observe many fautes which would trouble the sense, those I leave to the Courteous Reader to correct, these (among others) I observed: Pag. 10 l. 21. r. *proid.* l. 22. r. *Covenant.* for *Council.* p. 23. *excep.* p. 43. for *Smith.* *saith.*



such trouble
nor the sense

